OF ONE BLOOD

A Short Study of the Race Problem

ROBERT E. SPEER

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

SM20
M85

OF ONE BLOOD

A Short Study of the Race Problem

By ROBERT E. SPEER

God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.—Acts 17: 26.

COUNCIL OF WOMEN FOR HOME MISSIONS
AND
MISSIONARY EDUCATION MOVEMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA
NEW YORK

1924
LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY

COPYRIGHT, 1924, BY THE
COUNCIL OF WOMEN FOR HOME MISSIONS
AND
MISSIONARY EDUCATION MOVEMENT
OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Printed in the United States of America

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

301.451
S742

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I THE ORIGIN AND NATURE OF RACE 1

1. Origin of Race. 2. Inheritance and Education. 3. Races Are Free for Progress. 4. What Is Race? 5. What Races Are There? 6. Races Are Not United Within. 7. There Are No Pure Races. 8. The Unity of Man. 9. The Origin of Race-consciousness. 10. The Rise of the Modern Race Problem.

II THE IDEA OF RACE SUPERIORITY 33

1. Each Race Claims Superiority. 2. The Idea of Racial Inequality. 3. Errors in Racial Judgments. 4. Four Conclusions.

III THE GOOD AND GAIN OF RACE AND RACE DISTINCTION 66

1. Our Race Is Our Mother. 2. Race Enriches Humanity. 3. Racial Self-determination and Pride. 4. Economic Interdependence of Races. 5. The Contributions of the Races. 6. The Larger Experience of Christianity.

IV THE EVILS AND ABUSES OF RACE 97

1. Racial Antipathy and Fear. 2. Race Prejudice a Hindrance in Many Ways. 3. Two Comforting Considerations. 4. The Abuse of Weaker Races. 5. Our Treatment of Indians, Chinese, Italians, and Others. 6. The Armenians. 7. Intolerance and Lynching. 8. Racial Arrogance.

N12810

CHAPTER PAG

V ASPECTS AND RELATIONS OF RACE 12

1. Race and Color. 2. Race and Climate. 3. Race, Nationality, and Language. 4. Race and Communications. 5. Race and Social Ideals. 6. Race and Religion. 7. Christianity and Race.

VI THE SOLUTION OF THE RACE PROBLEM . . . 16

1. The Solution of Conflict. 2. The Solution of Segregation. 3. The Solution of Subjection. 4. The Solution of Eugenics. 5. The Solution of Amalgamation. 6. The Solution of Christianity.

VII SOME SPECIFIC RACE PROBLEMS OF TODAY . . 20

1. Relation of White and Negro Races. 2. Immigration and the Race Problem. 3. The Mexicans and the Japanese. 4. The Indians and the Jews. 5. Our Relations to Latin America. 6. Race Problems in All Lands.

Reading List 2

Index 2

PREFACE

The deepest conviction back of this book is that the Son of God, Jesus Christ, is the one solution of the race problem as of every other moral and social problem. He came to be the Savior of the world and to establish on earth the Kingdom of God. Race wrong and injustice are sin, and Christ came to save man from sin, the sin of each man and the sin of the race. When all men, or enough men, love and obey Him, race misunderstanding and maladjustment will come to an end, and all peoples will walk and work together in peace and unity. These pages begin with this conviction and end with it.

It should perhaps be said that these studies grew into a volume twice the size of this book and that it has been necessary, accordingly, to compress the material into half the space which the author would have been glad to use. One whole chapter written by the late Sir Narayan Chandavarkar of Bombay, one of the wisest and best men in India, it has been necessary to omit altogether.

The unabridged material, including Sir Narayan's chapter and other contributions from friends like Professor F. W. Williams of Yale, who have liberally given their help, will be published in the autumn of 1924 by the Fleming H. Revell Co. under the title, *Race and Race Relations.* The volume is included in the

list of reference books suggested at the end of th volume for the classes studying race problems. It w seek to treat more fully the questions discussed in th smaller book and also to serve as a source book f leaders.

The author desires to acknowledge his grateful ob gations to Professor William Adams Brown, Profess Edwin G. Conklin, Professor D. J. Fleming, D George E. Haynes, Mr. Bruno Lasker, and Morn Williams, Esq., who have read this book in manuscri or in proof and have made invaluable suggestions a criticisms. None of them is in any measure whatev responsible for the views set forth, but any writer happy who can have the advantage of such counsel a corrections as they have generously given.

ROBERT E. SPEER

NEW YORK CITY
February, 1924

CHAPTER I

The Origin and Nature of Race

1. Origin of Race

The questions of race and race relationships are the most insistent questions of the modern world. But there is no agreement as to what race is, as to how races originated, as to the character of racial differences, as to the meaning of race distinctions in human history, as to the solution of the problems of the relations of race to race, or as to the ultimate destiny of the present races of mankind.

The thesis of this book is simply the Christian view of these questions. It holds that God made of one blood all races of men and that all races are but parts of one human race. Mankind is one great kindred of all men. That is what the word "mankind" means. In this view races are not conceived as biological fixtures but simply as enlarged family groups which are subject to molding and transforming influences just as families are. And the life of each race and of all races, that is, of humanity, is not explicable on any mechanistic or materialistic basis. God is at work in human life, and organic and personal energies which represent freedom and spiritual purpose are the determining forces in directing human history. This is not an arbitrary prejudgment. It is the reasonable

conclusion from the actual facts of race and race relationships.

The study of the race problem should begin with the kindly and humane recognition of a race as simply an enlarged family. This is the origin of race according to the Bible and in the view of all the Semitic peoples.

The antique conception of kinship is participation in one blood, which passes from parent to child and circulates in the veins of every member of the family. The unity of the family or clan is viewed as a physical unity, for the blood is the life,—an idea familiar to us from the Old Testament, —and it is the same blood and therefore the same life that is shared by every descendant of the common ancestor. The idea that the race has a life of its own, of which individual lives are only parts, is expressed even more clearly by picturing the race as a tree, of which the ancestor is the root or stem and the descendants the branches. This figure is used by all the Semites, and is very common both in the Old Testament and in the Arabian poets.[1]

And the Semitic view is the view which is universally true. This family tie, however, has never been exclusively the tie of blood relationship. "The mere tie of blood-relationship was of no account among the Romans. . . . The tie of family was not the tie of blood; it was not the tie produced by marriage and by generation but a bond created by civil law—a bond of power." [2] In other words, the family, just like the race, is a social and not a physiological institution.[3]

[1] Smith, W. Robertson, *The Religion of the Semites*, p. 41.
[2] Ortolan, *History of Roman Law;* quoted in Storrs, *The Divine Origin of Christianity*, p. 462.
[3] Le Roy, A., *The Religion of the Primitive*, Chap. III.

Because each race is in reality only an enlarged family group it is right to conceive of its growth as governed in the main by the same processes which shape the character and growth of a family. Common experiences accentuate family consciousness and character. Common memories and traditions which store up bits of common experience, as well as biological kinship, bind a family together and give it a temper and note of its own. The weight of such communities of interest and life in a race is immeasurably great.[1]

2. *Inheritance and Education*

In the family life there are prenatal and transmitted characteristics, but each family as we know it, and likewise each race, is the product not only of these inherited tendencies but also of its environment and education. Changed conditions can undo family and race inferiorities or dissimilarities.[2] The processes that pro-

[1] "Many anthropologists discuss race as though what kept it together were purely a biological kinship. This is not so; in a sense the terms race and nation are interchangeable; in both the element of common memories, traditions, experience, is present as well as common blood; only the relative weight of these two factors differs. In the family, properly speaking, the biological factor also is only one of the ties of union. For instance, in some of the greatest dynasties the proportion of the founder's blood in those who after several centuries still adhere to his patronymic and pride themselves on their descent is almost nonexistent, so small. The clan, the tribe, indeed any large family in a primitive community, is composed not only of blood relatives but also the relatives by marriage and their offspring. What makes it a clan, a tribe, or a family is exactly the spiritual bond."—Bruno Lasker.

[2] It is held by some that this statement is not true of inherited traits. But how did racial traits come into existence? Surely

duced them can modify them. We see this happening before our eyes in the case of families. In a generation two families may completely exchange their character and conditions as a result of outward circumstances or of the action of individuals who rise above and reverse the family inheritance. With a slower movement and by a more intricate process races may change, and they are not debarred from change by any prohibitory racial determinism. At the Universal Races Congress in London in 1911, Dr. Myers of the University of Cambridge read a paper on "The Permanence of Racial Mental Differences" in which he laid down these propositions:

"I. That the mental characters of the majority of the peasant class throughout Europe are essentially the same as those of primitive communities.

"II. That such differences between them as exist are the result of differences in environment and in individual variability.

"III. That the relation between the organism and its environment (considered in its broadest sense) is the ultimate cause of variation, bodily and mental.

"IV. That this being admitted, the possibility of the progressive development of all primitive peoples must be conceded, if only the environment can be appropriately changed."

And he closed his paper with the assertion: "If only

they are not eternal. And if by some process they were produced, as they certainly were, the same or kindred process can modify or transform them.

the environment can be gradually changed, perhaps with sufficient slowness and certainty in the appropriate direction, both the mental and the physical characters of the lowest races may ultimately attain those of the highest, and vice versa. If we assume, as I think we must assume, that the white and Negro races owe their respective characters ultimately to their environment, there is no *a priori* reason, it seems to me, for denying the possibility of a reversal of their differences, if the environment to which they are respectively exposed be gradually, in the course of many hundreds of thousands of years, reversed."

It is not necessary to enter into the familiar issue over heredity and education. How do we know that what we call heredity in children may not be the influence of parental companionship, and in race the influence of social environment? It is enough to note that whatever the force of heredity in racial character may be, it is not sovereign and unalterable. No race is doomed by its inheritance to incapacity for progress and change. Nor is any race secured by its inheritance against deterioration and ruin.

The origin and history of a race undoubtedly shape its character.[1] And there are anthropologists who hold that race heredity is the supreme determining power. Professor Edwin Conklin is one of these.

Undoubtedly good environment and good education are important factors in the development of good citizens, but of

[1] Taine, H. A., *History of English Literature*, Vol. I, Introduction, Section V.

even greater importance is good heredity. Indeed it is not mere chance or accident that certain forms of civilization have arisen among certain races and other forms among other races; on the contrary, inherited characteristics have to a large extent determined the type of civilization which any race manifests. The qualities and achievements of nations are due less to governments than to grandmothers. . . . It is the duty of biology to teach the nation that heredity is more potent than environment or education.[1]

Professor McDougall also argues that the chief influence in determining national characteristics is racial inheritance:

The circumstance and environment may modify, or even check for a time, the effects of the inherited racial characteristics; but these will always come out again and make themselves felt, and being thus the most persistent element in man's mental make-up, they will appear as the dominant influence in the development of the character and point of view of the group.[2]

Mr. Lothrop Stoddard represents the extremest form of this view of the rigid determinism of race inheritance. He holds that racial momentum is more powerful than ideas or institutions.[3] He even believes that heredity is responsible for race decay:

"The whole weight of scientific evidence shows that degeneracy is caused not by environment but by hered-

1 Conklin, Edwin G., "Biology and National Welfare," *Yale Review*, April, 1917, pp. 476-477.

2 Field, G. C., "The Influence of Race in History and Politics," *Hibbert Journal*, Jan., 1923, p. 288.

3 Stoddard, Lothrop, *The New World of Islam*, p. 35.

ity; that the degeneracy with which we have to deal is an old degeneracy due to taints which have been carried along in the germ plasm for generations." [1]

Mr. Stoddard is speaking of the one race which he considers superior. If that race is tainted with hereditary degeneracy, and race inheritance is the absolutely dominating force, it is a dark outlook for that race and for all races. And Mr. Stoddard goes over bodily to the most rigid racial determinism. He rejects John Stuart Mills' statement: "Of all vulgar modes of escaping from the consideration of the effect of social and moral influences on the human mind, the most vulgar is that of attributing the diversity of conduct and character to inherent natural differences." [2] He accepts Woods's deliverance: "Experimentally and statistically, there is not a grain of proof that ordinary environment can alter the salient mental and moral traits in any measurable degree from what they were predetermined to be through innate influence." [3] And he sets forth as his own view that:

> . . . it has been conclusively proved that intelligence is predetermined by heredity; that individuals come into the world differing vastly in mental capacities; that such differences remain virtually constant throughout life and cannot be lessened by environment or education; that the present mental level of any individual can be definitely ascertained, and even a child's future adult mental level confidently predicted. These are surely discoveries whose practical importance can hardly be overestimated. They enable us to grade not merely

[1] Stoddard, Lothrop, *The Revolt against Civilization*, p. 248.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 39.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 48.

individuals but whole nations and races according to their inborn capacities.[1]

3. Races Are Free for Progress

But this is a very subjective and passing view. Men who seek to look at all the facts can accept no such pessimistic theory. They have to recognize the power of education to modify inheritance. Thus Professor Conklin writes:

> The quality of citizenship in this country, or in any other, depends not merely upon the stock or race but also upon the environmental conditions. Environment and education do not change heredity, but they do modify development. If there is one thing in biology more certain than another, it is that good environment cannot make good heredity out of that which is bad, but it can and does lead to the development in the individual of good potentialities which are present in heredity, and to the suppression of bad ones. There are many alternative possibilities in each of us, and which ones will develop depends upon education and environment. Ideals and habits have a hereditary basis, but their development depends upon extrinsic conditions. A good citizen is one who has good social ideals and habits, and these are to a certain extent the result of his training and surroundings.[2]

Mr. Field goes much further in reviewing Professor McDougall's *The Group Mind.* He admits that all influence of racial inheritance in explaining racial differences cannot be absolutely disproved, but he declares, "All attempts to isolate it and trace its working break

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 56.
[2] Conklin, article previously cited, p. 482.

down. It is not a measurable factor in the development of the national character and institutions, and cannot be taken into account for any practical purposes." [1]

And Professor Ross says:

Heredity is a cheap offhand explanation of the characteristics of a people at a given moment, but how is it that continually characteristics change when there has been no change in heredity? The observed traits of French, Germans, and English today are by no means the same as the traits they manifested about the middle of the last century. Many of the faults of contemporary South American character can easily be duplicated from the history of our own people. Today we succeed in making certain virtues fairly general among ourselves because gradually our society has equipped itself with the home training, the education, the religion, the ideals of life, the standards of conduct, and the public opinion competent to produce these virtues. Societies that lack the right soul molds will of course fail to obtain these virtues. But there is no reason why they may not borrow such molds from the more experienced societies, just as we ourselves have sometimes done.[2]

There is no fiat of fixed racial destiny. Races like families and individuals are free by right choices and under the influence of right forces to move on into a new and different character.

As Finot says, "All the condemnations of peoples and races in virtue of an innate superiority or inferiority have in reality failed. Life has taught us to be more circumspect in our judgments. A savant who

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, Jan., 1923, p. 299.
[2] Ross, Edward Alsworth, *South of Panama*, p. 249.

presumes to pronounce a verdict of eternal barbarism against any people deserves to be laughed at." [1]

The door of life and hope is wide open to all races.

4. What Is Race?

But what is race? What are its fundamental criteria? The extreme biological view conceives that there is a fixed racial germ plasm which by heredity is absolutely determinative of racial character and of the character of individual members of each race. This is Mr. Stoddard's view. But the zoological difference in the germ plasm of different races cannot be found by the microscope nor can it be discovered by any chemical analysis. It is a biological hypothesis. A more moderate view finds the racial differentia in various physiological measurements as to the size and shape of the head. Professor Dixon's definition and classification of races rest on three of these measurements, "the cranial or cephalic index, the altitudinal or length-height index and the nasal index." The old theories dealt crudely with long and narrow-headed races and with broad and flat-headed, but Professor Dixon finds all kinds of heads in the same race, although certain of the twenty-seven possible combinations of his three indices predominate in the various races and sub-races. But Finot makes merry with these indices and with all brain measurements. "The

[1] Finot, Jean, *Race Prejudice*, p. 174 ff.

truth is that the skull and the brain furnish no arguments in favor of organic inequality." [1]

Other teachers find the root of race difference in the glands and look for the principle of racial distinction and classification here. Professor Conklin, who believes racial heredity to be stronger than racial education, still thinks "that many characteristics which have hitherto been regarded as hereditary or racial may be due to environmental causes; it is probable, for example, that stature, long-headedness (dolichocephaly) or round-headedness (brachycephaly) and so forth, may sometimes be caused by higher or lower activity of the thyroid gland and that this may be influenced by food, particularly by the iodine intake." [2] And now still other theories appear which go beyond the thyroid gland and the iodine intake to different activities of the pituitary body in different races.

Sir Arthur Keith says:

> We are justified in regarding the pituitary gland as one of the principal pinions in the machinery which regulates the growth of the human body and is directly concerned in determining stature, cast of features, texture of skin, and character of hair—all of them marks of race. When we compare the chief racial types of humanity—the Negro, the Mongol, and the Caucasian or European—we can recognize in the last-named a greater predominance of the pituitary than in the other two. The sharp and pronounced nasalization of the face, the tendency to strong eyebrow ridges, the

[1] Finot, *Race Prejudice*, Part I, Chap. VI, "The Divisions of Humanity from a Craniological Point of View."

[2] Conklin, *The Direction of Human Evolution*, p. 35.

prominent chin, the tendency to bulk of body and height of stature in the majority of Europeans are best explained, so far as the present state of our knowledge goes, in terms of pituitary function.[1]

And what is the pituitary body? The Century Dictionary defines it as "a small, ovoid, pale-reddish body occupying the silla turcica and attached to the under surface of the cerebellum by the infundibulum." This is a far more wonderful world than we have ever dreamed if this is the explanation of the problem of race and the human history which has grown out of it.

These biological views regarding race signs and race heredity become of grave social significance when they are made the ground of theories of race determinism. It is not, however, of germ plasm or cranial measures or thyroid or pituitary glands that the man in the street is thinking when he talks of race and race characteristics. It is quite other elements that he has in mind. As Professor Dixon says, in the opening paragraph of his great volume, our popular conception of race embraces more than the anthropologist's biological conception.

We refer to the Negro or the Mongolian "race" and in so doing have in mind primarily certain general physical characteristics of color, hair, and features, while linguistic, cultural, historical, and political factors play but a comparatively subordinate part in our conception. We also speak, however, of the Latin, the Anglo-Saxon, or the Celtic "race," but here, although physical characteristics are in some meas-

[1] Thomson, J. Arthur, *The Outline of Science*, Vol. IV, p. 1097.

ure concerned, it is more on language and culture, and in considerable degree on historical and political unity that our mental picture rests. From the standpoint of the anthropologist this latter use of the word "race" is inadmissible, for to him a race is a biological group, based on community of physical characters. For groups characterized on the one hand by linguistic, or on the other hand by cultural, historical, or political unity, he employs the terms "stock" and "nation." [1]

5. *What Races Are There?*

For us, however, in this study the word "race" must bear this wider, human significance and it must mean the same thing in the case of Negro and Caucasian, of Yellow and Brown peoples. It is not chiefly a matter of color either of skin or of blood. Predominantly it is a matter of group-culture and inheritance. There are different skin colors, and we shall consider their significance later, and there are writers who speak of "white blood" and "black blood" and who believe presumably in brown and yellow blood, which shows how easy it is for men to fall under obsessions in their views of race. In strict scientific sense there is no sure racial classification, nor any sure theory of racial origin. There is only the possibility of a broad division of human groups marked with more or less vague general characteristics of color and habitat and culture, of inheritance and social standards and ideals. We speak of the white, brown, yellow, black, and red races,—Aryan or Caucasian, Hindu and Malay and Arab, Mongolian,

[1] Dixon, Roland B., *The Racial History of Man*, p. 3.

Negro, Indian,—but the terms are disputable or confused, and the groups overlap and are both deeply divided and commingled within. Such confusions of definition, however, do not destroy the fact of race. They only make the problem the more interesting and difficult. There are, however, some anthropologists who in view of the confusion deny the validity of the concept of race altogether.

"Race," says Professor Ross, "is the cheap explanation tyros offer for any collective trait they are too stupid or too lazy to trace to its origin in the physical environment, the social environment, or historical conditions." [1]

And Finot says, going to the opposite extreme from Stoddard:

> The history of civilization is only a continual come and go of peoples and races! All, without distinction of their biological characteristics, are summoned to this great struggle for life wherein we fight for human progress and happiness. All the ethnical elements can take part in it, all can contend for places of honour in it. Such is the general import of our biological and psychological equality, which remains intact underneath all our superficial divisions.
>
> In the present state of science it has become impossible for us to distinguish the ethnical origins of peoples. The constituent elements are so much intermingled that the most ardent partisans of inequality must admit the relationship of all the races. The purity of blood which we create at will, and which we find in the animal world, becomes impossible in the human *milieu*. The Negroes are related to the Whites, who are linked to the Yellows, as these last

[1] Ross, *Social Psychology*, p. 3.

have common links both with Negroes and Whites. On the road which separates them we only meet with links which unite them.

As it is impossible to shut up human souls in dogmatic and eternal formulas, it is equally impossible to enclose human beings in immutable racial moulds. But more. As we have had the opportunity of proving, the word "race" cannot be used to determine the specific character of the floating distinctions between members of the human unity.

In one word, the term "race" is only a product of our mental activities, the work of our intellect, and outside all reality. Science had need of races as hypothetical limits, and these "products of art," to use Lamarck's expression, have become concrete realities for the vulgar. Races as irreducible categories only exist as fictions in our brains.[1]

But it is not possible in this bold way to do away with the reality of race. We may not be able to formulate a scientific definition of race or to establish a clear classification of fixed races, but the broad fact is one of the surest realities in the world. The commonly accepted grouping of mankind recognizes three rough general divisions. Thomson states this prevalent view as follows:

More for convenience than with conviction, ethnologists are accustomed to recognize three primary groups of human races—the black, the yellow, and the white. Each group has numerous subdivisions or races, each race may have its sub-race, each sub-race its breeds, each breed its stocks.

1. The group of Black or Negroid races is typically characterized by darkly pigmented skin, frizzly hair, a broad flat nose, thick lips, prominent eyes, large teeth, a narrow hip-girdle, and long heads (dolichocephaly). But there is

[1] Finot, *Race Prejudice*, p. 317.

a great variety within the group, which includes African Negroes, South African Bushmen, various pygmy races, together with such divergent types as the Melanesians and the Australian blackfellows (who have not frizzly hair).

2. The group of Yellow or Mongolian races is typically characterized by yellowish skin, black straight hair, broad face with prominent cheek bones, small nose, sunken narrow eyes, moderately sized teeth, and diverse types of skull. Here come in Chinese, Japanese, Tibetans, Siamese, Burmese; Malays, Brown Polynesians, Maoris, Esquimaux, and Red Indians; and most divergent of all, the Lapps and Finns, the Magyars and Turks.

3. The group of White or Caucasian races is typically characterized by soft and straight hair, well-developed beard, retreating cheek bones, narrow and prominent nose, small teeth, and broad hip-girdle. But the group includes along with the fair-haired and white-skinned peoples of Northern Europe, the dark-haired and often dark-complexioned southerners. Thus in Europe we may distinguish the tall and blond Nordics, the stocky dark Alpines, and the small dark Mediterraneans, while in Asia there are the Indo-Aryan and other types. It hardly requires to be said, for the heterogeneity of our enumeration is so evident, that these primary groups—Negroid, Mongolian, and Caucasian—do not mean very much scientifically; yet every one will admit that a Persian is nearer to a Britisher than a Hottentot is, and we think we understand what an Arab is after, while a Chinaman remains a sphinx.[1]

Professor Thomson rejects as no longer tenable the former idea of an ancient trifurcation of the human species into these three, black, yellow, and white, or any other primary races.

[1] Thomson, *The Outline of Science*, Vol. IV, p. 1095 f.; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, art. on "Ethnology."

How clearly unsatisfactory is our attempt to say what races there really are! None the less, there are different races and racial distinctions which are real and deep. But, in the first place, we find that there are deeper divisions within some of the accepted races of men than there are between these races and other races or at least between some of their individual members; secondly, that there are no pure and unmixed races unless among some of those ranked lowest; and thirdly, that the unity of man is unmistakably more real and conclusive than his racial diversification.

6. *Races Are Not United Within*

There are divisions intra-race more marked than the inter-race divisions.

(a) In the common classification the Jew belongs to the Caucasian or white group. But the inaccuracy of the color test is seen in the fact that there are Black Jews. If color is the criterion of race, then the Jews are not a race. Perhaps indeed they are not. Later we shall consider this. For the present it is enough to state that the Jews are counted a race within the Caucasian group, and yet the practical racial division (socially even if not biologically) between the Jews and the rest of this group is greater than the division between American and Chinese students in American universities.

(b) The English and the Scotch-Irish are of one comparatively intimate race starting within the Caucasian group, but they have clashed with one another

more than the Scotch-Irish have ever clashed with the French, a more distant stock, or with the Dutch. Indeed, so deep was the antagonism between Scotch-Irish and English at the time of the Revolutionary War that the issue of the war really turned upon it. "The more one studies the details of the struggle, the more remarkable appears the successful issue. It seemed little less than a miracle to Washington himself when he calmly reviewed it in later days." The affair remains a mystery until we consider the effect of the "Ulster migration" and of the deep antipathy of the Scotch-Irish immigrants due to the wrongs they had suffered from English landlords and English commercial policy.[1]

(c) Again and again in human history economic forces or other general influences have proved stronger than race cohesion. We may not agree with the rather cynical judgment of a recent French writer in *Le Temps:*

> Above all we must never forget that peoples are not linked together by racial ties, by resemblances, nor even by blood relationship. All this is material for couplets about sister nations and academic speechifying at the Sorbonne or at the Capitol. Racial resemblances mainly influence men of the same culture—the chosen few. No, what brings peoples together and unites them is a solid network of common interests, common and tangible profits. These are the realities that bring themselves home to thousands of men—the workers, who are the strength of the population of a country.[2]

[1] Ford, Henry Jones, *The Scotch-Irish in America*, p. 526.

[2] Galtier, Joseph, "Some Fascist Doctrines," *Le Temps*, April 19, 1923. Quoted in *The Living Age*, May 26, 1923, p. 442.

We do not yield to this extreme economic view. But we must recognize the truth in it; namely, that many influences common to humanity are stronger than the solidarity of race. Racial unity is by no means one of the strongest human forces. The most dreadful war in American history was fought between brothers of one race, and the occasion of the conflict was another race. Difference over the Negro was more powerful than white agreement.[1] And in the World War races were found allied with stranger races warring against races to which they were kindred by blood.

(d) Our broad slashing race divisions according to color which dominate the current alarmist propaganda classify all the East Indian people together as brown, and treat them as a single element. But this is pure fiction. The people of India are not all brown, and they are less tightly bound together than many of them are bound to us.

The general truth which needs to be understood is clearly stated by Professor Boas:

"The differences between different types of man are on the whole small as compared to the range of variation in each type. . . . The differences between the average types of the white and of the Negro, that have a bearing upon vitality and mental ability, are much less than the individual variations in each case." [2]

[1] *Report of Universal Races Congress*, 1911, p. 43. The full title of this volume, to be often quoted, is "Papers on Inter-racial Problems presented to the First Universal Races Congress, held at the University of London, July 26-29, 1911, edited by G. Spiller."

[2] Boas, Franz, *The Mind of Primitive Man*, pp. 94, 269.

7. *There Are No Pure Races*

There are no pure or unmixed races unless they may be found among some of those ranked lowest.

Professor Conklin says:

If in the past God made of one blood all nations of men, it is certain that at present there is being made from all nations one blood. By the interbreeding of various races and breeds there has come to be a complicated intermixture of racial characters in almost every human stock, and this process is going on today more rapidly and extensively than ever before. Strictly speaking, there are no "pure" lines in any human group. If so-called "pure" English, Irish, Scotch, Dutch, German, Russian, French, Spanish, or Italian lines are traced back only a few generations, they are found to include many foreign strains, and this is especially true of American families, even those of "purest" blood.[1]

And long ago Galton set forth the same view in words which recognized the changeability of human character and the mutability of race.

Man is so educable an animal that it is difficult to distinguish between that part of his character which has been acquired through education and circumstance, and that which was in the original grain of his constitution. His character is exceedingly complex, even in members of the simplest and purest savage race; much more is it so in civilized races, who have long since been exempted from the full rigour of natural selection, and have become more mongrel in their breed than any other animal on the face of the earth.[2]

[1] Conklin, *The Direction of Human Evolution*, p. 47.

[2] Galton, Francis, *Inquiries into Human Faculty*, Chap. on "Nurture and Nature."

The fiction of race purity is greatest perhaps in the case of the European peoples, who represent in reality such an intermixture that no racial analysis is possible. Even the idea of a great Nordic race, fair-haired, long-headed, of pure white blood, the racial aristocrats of history, is now called in question. Professor Dixon finds the Nordic race to have been made up of a blending of the Caspian and Mediterranean types "but with considerable elements of the older Proto-Australoid and Proto-Negroid."[1] Many students join in this idea of a Negroid strain in the European races, both Mediterranean and Nordic.[2] That the Nordic race is passing is true today as it has been true for thousands of years. For good or ill, all races are passing into the human race.

Dixon says:

That the Nordic race, the result of the long blending in the Baltic lands of the remnants of the older Palæolithic folk with the Caspian and Mediterranean peoples during Neolithic times, is gradually passing from the stage would seem, from the evidence, to be only too true. But their passing is not a recent matter—it has been going on for thousands of years, and was already far advanced before the discovery of America. They have played their part, and it has been a great part, in the world's history. As a "race," as a complex of just these particular factors in just this combination, it seems doomed in the end to be absorbed in the wider complex which has been forming ever since the Alpine peoples made their appearance in Europe. It is passing, just as the purer Mediterranean peoples are and for long

1 Dixon, *The Racial History of Man*, p. 510.
2 DuBois, W. E. B., *The Negro*, p. 21.

have been passing, in the sense of sinking into the greater racial entity which has been so long in process of growth.[1]

8. *The Unity of Man*

The unity of man is unmistakably more real and conclusive than his racial diversification. Beneath and above all the races is the one human race, one in origin and one in essential nature. "Fair and dark races, long and short-headed, intelligent and primitive," says Von Luschan, "all come from one stock." [2] "Systematists generally agree," says Conklin, "that there is at present but one species of man, namely, *homo sapiens,* and that all races and varieties have arisen in the first instance from a common human stock." [3] Men are many but man is one, with a unity that is rich with the originality of God. As a Hebrew rabbi remarked at a little race conference in New York: "When human kings issued coinage they stamped their image on the coins and they all looked alike. When God stamped his image on men they all looked different."

[1] Dixon, *The Racial History of Man,* p. 520. See also Grant, Madison, *The Passing of the Great Race;* Gould, *America, a Family Matter;* and *The New York Times* editorial, "The Perfect Race," Nov. 12, 1922. We quote the following paragraph from the last-named:

"'Historians,' says Mr. Madison Grant, 'have never considered race.' Maybe that is because nobody knows just what race is except these inspired Nordic theologians. There is reason for their continual falling back on German arguments. The religion of a superior race was necessary to pan-Germanism; outside of Germany it rather fails to convince. There are good arguments against unrestricted immigration, but this Nordic nonsense is not one of them."

[2] *Universal Races Congress,* 1911, p. 21.

[3] Conklin, *The Direction of Human Evolution,* p. 34.

The ethnologists can find no evidence for any doctrine which denies the unity of man. Our own human experience teaches us the same lesson. We are at variance with the human facts and with the reality of life until we come into the personal and the social realization of the solidarity of humanity.

9. *The Origin of Race-consciousness*

When did the consciousness of race and of racial differences first come to men? What evidence of its presence do we find, and what forms did it take among the ancient peoples? Mr. Marvin finds the feeling of race consciousness earliest among the ancient Greeks.

> They were the first to distinguish between themselves, the city-founding, freedom-loving, philosophizing Hellenes and the other races whom they met with, who did not possess these qualities and uttered a strange and unintelligible speech, and were hence called "Barbaroi," or stammerers. The Romans, as they came into the same Greek system of city-states and civilized life, were admitted within the pale. We thus gain from the quick, questioning, analytic mind of Greece the first division between Western Races and the World. . . . Side by side with the birth of this consciousness of a superior civilization, comes the first deliberate effort to train up each generation of fresh members of the community in the traditions, the habits, and the meaning of the civilization which they had inherited.[1]

The Roman consciousness of race began with a sense of Rome's indebtedness to the Greek race. The discerning Romans realized that they had been themselves

[1] *Western Races and the World*, edited by F. S. Marvin, p. 20. See also pp. 50-60.

among the barbarians and in joke, at least, they applied the word to their native culture and even spoke of their own language as "a barbarous tongue."

This racial respect for the Greeks was perhaps a mark of the more intelligent and rational feeling. Among the mass of the people and with the politicians who manipulated them the orthodox view was contempt for the Greeks. Cicero speaks of Crassus as seeking influence by affecting to despise the Greeks and of Antonius doing so by affecting ignorance of their culture. As the Roman conquests grew under Julius Cæsar it is clear that he cherished the idea of a cosmopolitan world state. He gave Roman citizenship indiscriminately to men of many races, but died with his full plans undeveloped. He took Africans and Asiatics to Gaul. What happened in the World War in France had happened two thousand years before. By the time of Augustus it had become clear that Rome must find some solution of the problem of her relations to her subject races of varying degrees of culture. He did not repeat Cæsar's experiment of introducing Gauls into the Roman Senate which had offended Roman prejudice. He checked the infiltration of alien blood into the citizen stock and reimposed slavery restrictions which had been relaxed by Cæsar.

The deliberate policy of the Roman Empire was unity by Romanization.[1] A system of municipal institutions was created which reconciled the unity of the State with

[1] *Ibid.*, Chap. by H. Stuart Jones on "The Roman Empire," pp. 78, 83.

a measure of local freedom and promoted "the rise of the more backward races of the Empire to a higher plane of civilization" in accordance with "a cardinal principle of Rome's policy to establish an ordered graduation of status and privilege by which her subjects might climb to an equality with the ruling race." [1] Little by little the successors of Augustus "substituted fresh bonds of union for the older cohesive forces of race and tribe" and "built up like some coral island of the Southern seas a new Greco-Roman nationality."

Rome worked with a far clearer and surer recognition of the principle of human unity than characterized Greek thought. Aristotelian theory had declared the inequality of human nature. Cicero asserted, perhaps overasserted, its identity and equality. "There is no resemblance," he says, "in nature so great as that between man and man, there is no equality so complete. There is only one possible definition of mankind, for reason is common to all. Men differ indeed in learning, but are equal in the capacity for learning; there is no race which under the guidance of reason cannot attain to virtue." [2] Roman law and modern civilization rested upon this ideal.

And it was not Rome's theory and practice of human unity which led to her downfall. Her welcome to the new races brought her far more than they received from her. She lived on through them. It was not they who destroyed her. "The cause of decay," Mr.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[2] *Ibid.*, Chap. by A. J. Carlyle on "The Influence of Christianity," p. 111.

Stuart Jones holds, "lay deeper. The failure was a failure to solve the fundamental problem (with which we are still wrestling) of the relation of the individual to the State, especially the Great State." [1] The truth of human unity will destroy only those institutions which are built on false ideas of society and politics. And indeed it is the falsehood of these ideas and not the truth of human unity which is the destructive force.

Here and there in the New Testament there are references to these race feelings of Romans and Greeks, to racial prejudices and to the absorption of Jewish elements into Roman citizenship.[2] We shall consider later the teaching of Christianity and the New Testament with regard to race. But we must turn here to the facts as to race feeling among the Hebrews in the centuries before the Romans and Greeks. It is significant to note that the word "race" is not found in the King James Version of the Bible except in the sense of a running contest. What does this mean? It would seem to mean that the conception of race was not a living conception at the time the King James Version was made. The ancient racial problems had been solved or had dropped out of sight. The modern ones had not arisen. Hebrew and Greek words, accordingly, which we would now translate "race" were rendered "people," "nation," "heathen," "Gentiles." There are no clear distinctions in Hebrew thought or language between race and nation. The Hebrews spoke of themselves as

[1] *Ibid.*, Chap. by H. Stuart Jones on "The Roman Empire."
[2] Luke 7: 2-5; Acts 16; 18: 2; Col. 3: 11.

many nations and as many races, whereas they were, from our way of thinking, only one race and one nation. And they spoke of the peoples who were not Hebrews as peoples or nations or races indiscriminately, and Daniel speaks of languages in the same order, "All peoples, nations, and languages."

The education of the Hebrews was an education in the sense of race distinction and racial mission. It was begun distinctly as a process of racial and national differentiation (Gen. 12:1-3), and throughout the whole history the Old Testament writers make the purpose and meaning of the story as they understood it perfectly clear. In Egypt and then in Canaan they were disciplined to a sense of segregated national and racial personality. The conquest of the Promised Land was left incomplete as part of this training (Judges 2:21; 3:4). And the long tragic story of the nation's alternating prosperity and suffering is one of the most instructive chapters in the history of the race problem, with unequaled light on its significance and solution.

Under this education the ancient Hebrews acquired the sense of race distinction in a unique measure. The phrase, "The Chosen People," which we apply to them, does not occur in the Old Testament, but the word "chosen" is used a few times, and the idea, of course, was a dominant idea in the consciousness of Israel. The question which concerns us, however, is as to Israel's attitude to other races. A careful reading of the Old Testament does not support the view that the Hebrews held a narrow race view or disbelieved in the

solidarity of humanity. Abraham's call was a call, not to isolated racial privilege, but to racial training for universal human service (Gen. 12:1-3). Other races were conceded to have their own culture and worship. The Hebrews were indeed warned against what was unworthy in these (Deut. 12:30, 31), and their insufficiency was openly declared (II Kings 17:33; 19:12; II Chron. 32:15, 17, 23; Isa. 36:18; 37:12; Jer. 2:11). Adverse and hostile racial judgments occur (Micah 5:15; II Chron. 28:3; 33:9), but these are mild in comparison with the racial provocation which the moral condition of ancient culture afforded. And if we will compare the Revised Version of the Old Testament with the King James Version and will note the scores of passages where the Revised Version substitutes "nations" for "heathen" in the translation, we will be surprised to see how much of the supposed warrant for the idea of Old Testament race prejudice fades away. There are, to be sure, harsh racial notes in some of the old characters and incidents, but the Spirit of God which was seeking to make the Jews pure and faithful was seeking also to make them just and brotherly, and was succeeding. They learned to speak in friendly terms of the other races (Psa. 102:15; Zech. 9:10; Ezek. 38:23; 39:27; Mal. 1:11). They conceived Jehovah as the ruler of other nations as well as their own (Isa. 45:5; Jer. 27:7, 8; Joel 3:12). God purposed to fulfil the "desire of all nations" (Hag. 2:7), and peace was to be the law of the life of all peoples (Micah 4:3).

If some Hebrews forgot all this and thought of themselves as the one superior race destined to rule the world and of the other races as "lesser breeds without the law," they did only what some men in other races have done ever since and what more men are doing now, probably, than ever before.

10. The Rise of the Modern Race Problem

Indeed the race problem as we know it is a very modern problem. Take any dictionary of quotations and look for quotations on race and see if you can find one. Take up at random any dozen books on history and politics and look in the index for "race" and note the result. There is no article on "race" or the "race problem" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* or any other representative encyclopædia. What little there is on the subject will be found under "ethnology" or "anthropology." We are only now coming to appreciate the reality and significance of racial facts which have long been here but have not pressed upon us as they press today in our contracted and unified world.

Most of our "race problems" [says Professor Conklin] are of relatively recent origin and are caused chiefly by the pressure of population within certain centres and its overflow into other lands as well as by the importation of cheap labor. The white man in particular has forced himself on other races, and the pressure of whites into the lands of colored races has gone much farther than the reverse. Furthermore, the white man's demand for cheap labor is chiefly responsible for the importation of colored races into the

lands of the whites and for the general mixing up of all races of mankind. The present competition between races is a contest in the relative growth of populations and in economic progress rather than in military power.[1]

Even if this inevitable and progressive intermingling of the races were not occurring, the duty of reaching a right and true theory of race relations would remain, for there would still be a large measure of necessary inter-race communication. And if this were not true and each race were destined to live its own separate economic and social life, even so the mode of living of each race would depend upon its principles of education, and its individual and social ideals, and its conception of what humanity is and what its course of development and its destiny are to be. Each race must work out the true world theory, and this theory will be found to be not racial but human.

But the considerations mentioned by Professor Conklin are actual facts. The races are mingling in the tropics under necessities described by Mr. Kidd twenty-five years ago. He conceived that white invasion and domination of the tropics was inevitable and yet he recognized its difficulty.

In climatic conditions which are a burden to him; in the midst of races in a different and lower stage of development; divorced from the influences which have produced him, from the moral and political environment from which he sprang, the white man does not in the end, in such circumstances, tend so much to raise the level of the races amongst

[1] Conklin, *The Direction of Human Evolution*, p. 40.

whom he has made his unnatural home, as he tends himself to sink slowly to the level around him.[1]

Kidd's solution was the acceptance of the trust under a sense and acknowledgment of trusteeship. It seemed to him to be a permanent and enduring responsibility in which there was no room "for small-minded comparisons between the different merits of civilized races and peoples." He took for granted the reality of the inferiority of the uncivilized races and contended for "the holding of the tropics by the English-speaking peoples as a trust for civilization." What the relation of temperate and tropical races shall be in this situation and what the terms of the trusteeship which he advocated and which the "Mandates" of the League of Nations now recognize in the case of the former German colonies, are among the real race problems we must face.

And outside of the tropical and the north and south race relations, there are the race relationships which run east and west in the world and the relationships which are intra-national in Europe and above all now in the United States. What is the fundamental element in these relationships? Is it racial, or social, or economic? Is it a sense of instinctive racial antipathy, or is it the reaction of fear? We shall seek light on these questions. Meanwhile it is wise to emphasize two facts which are too often overlooked as elements in the growth of the race problem; namely, the fact of mass

[1] Kidd, Benjamin, *The Control of the Tropics*, p. 50.

contacts of races, and the fact of contacts of individuals of those races with other races and with individuals of those other races.

A primary cause of race friction [says a thoughtful Southern writer] is the vague, rather intangible but wholly real feeling of "pressure" which comes to the white man almost instinctively in the presence of a mass of people of a different race. In a certain important sense all racial problems are distinctly problems of racial distribution. Certainly the definite action of the controlling race, particularly as expressed in laws, is determined by the factor of the numerical difference between its population and that of the inferior group.[1]

The writer is speaking of the relations of the black and white races in the Southern States in America, but what he says is true in its measure elsewhere and of other races than "the white races" to whom he refers. All races everywhere today are being pressed against other races. The majority and minority elements in the association vary greatly. The contacts are both direct and personal and also indirect and economic or political. They are the most real and significant facts in modern history. However the races arose, whatever we may think of race and its nature and purpose, the race issues are here as a fact, and we have the problem of a right and just and peace-making solution of the racial questions insistently confronting us.

[1] Stone, Alfred Holt, *Studies in the American Race Problem*, p. 217.

CHAPTER II

The Idea of Race Superiority

1. Each Race Claims Superiority

It is an interesting fact that in behalf of each separate human race the claim of superiority has been made. We need not go beyond the list of present races as the color ethnologists define them.

The red people when they first met the whites were compelled to recognize and gradually submit to their power. But they had their own firm conviction of racial superiority. Jedediah Morse relates in *The American Universal Geography,* published in Boston in 1796, a story told thirty years before at a salt lick in Ohio to Colonel G. Morgan by an old Indian chief, eighty-four years of age, who was the head of a party of Iroquois and Wyandot Indians.

After the Great Spirit formed the world, he made the various birds and beasts which now inhabit it. He also made man, but having formed him white and very imperfect and ill-tempered he placed him on one side of it where he now inhabits and from whence he has lately found a passage across the water to be a plague to us. As the Great Spirit was not pleased with this his work, he took black clay and made what *you* call a Negro with a woolly head. This black man was made better than the white man, but still he did not answer the wish of the Great Spirit; that is, he was imperfect. At last, the Great Spirit, having procured a piece

of pure red clay, formed from it the Red Man, perfectly to his mind, and he was so well pleased with him that he placed him on this great island, separate from the white and black men; and gave him rules for his conduct, promising happiness in proportion as they should be observed. He increased exceedingly and was perfectly happy for ages; but the foolish young people, at length forgetting his rules, became exceedingly ill-tempered and wicked. In consequence of this, the Great Spirit created the great buffaloes, the bones of which you now see before us; these made war upon the human species alone, and destroyed all but a few, who repented and promised the Great Spirit to live according to his laws if he would restrain the devouring enemy. Whereupon he sent lightning and thunder and destroyed the whole race in this spot, but excepted a male and female which he shut up in yonder mountain, ready to let loose again, should occasion require.[1]

The yellow people when they first met the white races were entirely assured of their unique and primary place, and for generations treated the Western nations with scorn and pride; and who can deny the grounds of their judgment? They have been for ages the great center of light and civilization in Central and Eastern Asia. The Chinese have given literature and religion to the millions of Korea and Japan. Even a generation of Western civilization has not shaken Chinese influence off the thought and politics and ethics of Japan. Printing originated with the Chinese and was used by them hundreds of years before it was known in the West. The magnetic needle, gun-

[1] Morse, Jedediah, *The American Universal Geography*, Boston, 1796.

powder, silk fabrics, chinaware, and porcelain were old tales with the Chinese before our civilization began. Our latest ideas were wrought out by the Chinese ages ago—Civil Service examinations and assignment of office for merit and tested capacity, trades unions and labor organizations, and the sense of local responsibility in municipal administration. It is not to be wondered at that China has always looked down upon the other races and deemed them barbarians. And even after contact with the Western races this conviction remained. "China can do without foreigners, whilst foreigners are dependent on us," said Hia Sieh.[1] And there are Westerners today who prefer the civilization of the yellow race to that of the white. "I am inclined to think," says Bertrand Russell, "that Chinese life brings more happiness to the Chinese than English life does to us. . . . The Chinese are gentle, urbane, seeking only justice and freedom. They have a civilization superior to ours in all that makes for human happiness."[2] This is not true, but most of the Chinese race have hitherto believed it.

And the other great branch of the yellow race, the Japanese, although they are clearly a mixture of the yellow and the brown races, swinging down through the Chosen peninsula and up from the Dravidian areas in the islands to the south, are even more sure of their

[1] *Chinese Intercourse with Europe,* trans. by E. H. Parker, p. 55.

[2] Russell, Bertrand, *The Problem of China,* pp. 73, 175; see also two books by Englishmen posing as Chinese: Dickinson, *Letters from a Chinese Official,* and Lin Shao Yang, *A Chinese Appeal Concerning Christian Missions.*

racial ascendency. The Japanese race is taught to believe itself to be heaven-descended.

"The Emperors of our country," says Dr. Kakehi, "are persons equipped with qualities without parallel in the world; they are both the centers of (religious) faith and of temporal power. The center of this phenomenal world is the Mikado's Land (Mi-kuni; i.e., Japan). From this center we must expand this Great Spirit throughout the world." Kakehi declares with enthusiasm, "There are voices which cry, 'Great Japan is the Land of the Gods.' Nor is this to be wondered at. It is a true statement of fact. It is a matter of course. The expansion of Great Japan throughout the world and the elevation of the entire world into the Land of the Gods is the urgent business of the present, and again, it is our eternal and unchanging object." [1]

The brown race is, as we have seen, no single race at all, although our contemporary school of race theorists deals with them as a unity. The Indian leaders, whether they approve or condemn the preservation of race and caste distinctions in India, do not concede for a moment the superiority of the white race or of white civilization. The current tendency of thought in India is contempt for Western culture and the exaltation of the past of India. Rabindranath Tagore is only one, although he is in the West the best known, of the spokesmen of the mind of India. Of the East he writes:

Take it in whatever spirit you like, here is India, of about fifty centuries at least, who tried to live peacefully and think

[1] Holtom, *The Political Philosophy of Modern Shinto*, p. 119.

deeply, the India devoid of all politics, whose one ambition has been to know this world as of soul, to live here every moment of her life in the meek spirit of adoration, in the glad consciousness of an eternal and personal relationship with it.

Then turn to his parallel description of the West:

We have seen this great stream of civilisation choking itself from debris carried by its innumerable channels. We have seen that with all its vaunted love of humanity it has proved itself the greatest menace to man, far worse than the sudden outbursts of nomadic barbarism from which men suffered in the early ages of history. We have seen that, in spite of its boasted love of freedom, it has produced worse forms of slavery than ever were current in earlier societies—slavery whose chains are unbreakable, either because they are unseen or because they assume the names and appearance of freedom. We have seen, under the spell of its gigantic sordidness, man losing faith in all the heroic ideals of life which have made him great.

Finally, hear his injunction to his countrymen after he has summed up the horrors of modern civilization:—

"Be not ashamed, my brothers, to stand before the proud and the powerful
With your white robe of simpleness,
Let your crown be of humility, your freedom the freedom of the soul.
Build God's throne daily upon the ample bareness of your poverty
And know that what is huge is not great, and pride is not everlasting." [1]

[1] Tagore, Rabindranath. Quoted by Lord Meston in "India at the Crossways" in *The East and the West*, Jan., 1923, p. 68.

And Mr. Gandhi, who has been a far greater force in India, has preached the same doctrine. In his paper, *Young India,* January 26, 1921, he wrote: "My conviction is deeper today than ever. I feel that if India would discard modern civilization, she can only gain by doing so."

And the black race too is human like the other races. It believes in its superiority and sees no sublimity in the culture of the white race. One of its own writers, a French Negro, speaks for it with no pride, but only with the desire to enable the white race to help Africa.

> Civilization [he says], civilization, pride of the Europeans and charnel-house of innocents. . . . You have built your kingdom on corpses. Whatever you wish, whatever you do, you move in lies. At sight of you, gushing tears, shrieks of agony. You are might prevailing over right. You are not a torch, you are a conflagration. You devour whatever you touch. . . . If we knew of what vileness the great colonial life is composed, of what daily vileness, we should talk of it less, we should not talk of it at all.[1]

And his book is a picture of the life which the Africans whom he describes preferred to the life of the white people they knew and obeyed and despised.

DuBois denies the inferiority of the African. In his book, *The Negro,* he quotes Boas as saying, "When the European was still satisfied with rude stone tools, the Africans had invented or adopted the art of smelting iron"; and Torday, "We are indebted to the Negro

[1] Maran, Réné, *Batouala,* pp. 10, 13.

for the very keystone of our modern civilization and we owe him the discovery of iron." He himself continues:

> . . . Long before cotton weaving was a British industry, West Africa and the Soudan were supplying a large part of the world with cotton cloth. . . . Viewing the Basuto National Assembly in South Africa, Lord Bryce recently wrote, "The resemblance to the primary assemblies of the early peoples of Europe is close enough to add another to the arguments which discredit the theory that there is any such thing as an Aryan type of institutions." . . . Perhaps no race has shown in its earlier development a more magnificent art impulse than the Negro. . . . In disposition the Negro is among the most lovable of men.[1]

And others think as highly of the Negro's claim to superiority. The old Indian chief who talked to Colonel Morgan ranked the Negro above the white and next to the Indian. Few would assent to such a racial judgment, but few would dissent from the statement of von Luschan regarding individuals, "I am still seriously convinced that certain white men may be on a lower intellectual and moral level than certain colored Africans." [2]

The Latin American people, like the people of India, are a complex of races rather than a single race and, like the Indian, they are as convinced as any race of their right to deny any charges of racial inferiority. And at the present time they are specially clear that our North American culture is not an enviable or desirable thing, and that in comparison with it, except for

[1] DuBois, *The Negro*, pp. 114, 115, 116, 123, 137.
[2] *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, p. 22.

its energy and commercial efficiency, their own is better.

We Latin Americans [says José Enrique Rodó] have an inheritance of race, a great ethnic tradition to maintain, a sacred bond which unites us to immortal pages of history and puts us on our honour to preserve this for the future.

. . . . . .

Orphaned of the profound tradition that attended his birth, the North American has not yet replaced the inspiring ideality of his past with any high unselfish conception of the future. He lives for the immediate reality of the present, and for this subordinates all his activities in the egoism of material well-being, albeit both individual and collective. . . . Not even the selfishness of patriotism, for want of higher impulses, nor the pride of race, both of which transfigured and exalted in ancient days even the prosaic hardness of the life of Rome, can light a glimmer of ideality or beauty in a people where a cosmopolite confusion and the atomism of a badly understood democracy impede the formation of a veritable national conscience.[1]

Against all this, Rodó holds up the Latin American ideal:

Hospitable to things of the spirit, and not only to the immigrant throngs; thoughtful, without sacrificing its energy of action; serene and strong and withal full of generous enthusiasm; resplendent with the charm of morning calm like the smile of a waking infant, yet with the light of awakening thought.[2]

If we think these judgments unjust, are we sure that our own racial judgments are not so?[3]

[1] Rodó, J. E., *Ariel*, pp. 93, 122. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 137.

[3] See Calderon's criticism of North American culture and race character in *Latin America, Its Rise and Progress*, pp. 288, 289, 308, 311.

Even so-called savage people have been convinced of the real superiority of their race culture to that of other people who supposed themselves to be advanced races. When the United States and Great Britain and Germany partitioned the Samoan Islands, Malietoa Tanu protested against such a disposition of his kingdom and also addressed a letter to the London *Times* in which he asserted that "the civilization which had been introduced by the foreign governments into Polynesia was inferior to that which its inhabitants previously possessed." [1]

One of the most recent writers on the race question, Professor Josey in *Race and National Solidarity,* sets forth the superiority of the white race as the basis of its right to dominate the world and argues for the frank rejection of all universalistic conceptions including the weakness of the ideal of human brotherhood, and for the fresh acceptance of the mission of the white race to exercise world-sovereignty:

Races differ greatly in their ability to impose their will on nature and on other men. The complexity of their mental processes, their initiative and ingenuity, their contributions to the welfare of mankind, are by no means equal. In all these the white race excels. Just as we see man as a species dominating, excelling, and living on other forms of life, so we see the white race excelling the other races, acting as masters, and drawing to themselves a large part of the wealth

[1] Foster, John Watson, *American Diplomacy in the Orient,* p. 397. See account of the breaking down of the old civilization by the new with evil moral results in article by C. W. Abel, "Conflicting Forces in Papua," in *The Missionary Review of the World,* May, 1923.

of the world. The white races dominate mankind. They are the rulers *par excellence.* In the white man the evolutionary process seems to have reached its highest point. He is its culminating achievement.[1]

2. The Idea of Racial Inequality

The conviction of human inequality generalized into the sense of race or class superiority appears to be universal. It is certainly very ancient. No one race or class is left alone in the possession of the feeling of privilege and pride. It was and is an essential defect of the heathen temper in men that, in the interest of the assertion of their superiority of status or privilege over other races, they disbelieve in equality. The ancient world was under this curse. Some current ethnologists revive and affirm the old pre-Christian doctrine of a pluralistic humanity. They deride the language of the American Declaration of Independence with its assertion of human equality. And it is obvious enough that all men are not equal in height or weight or color or wealth or intellectual capacity or in a hundred other ways. But the broad principle of human equality, of the solidarity of man, of the unity of mankind remains, nevertheless, the true working principle. Any departure from it, when it is formulated or acted upon in the interest of privilege and not of service, or of isolation and not of brotherhood, reduces itself to folly or to harm. Some ethnologists are ready to arrange the races in a gradation of rank by head measure-

[1] Josey. *Race and National Solidarity,* p. 225.

ments, or facial angles, or aptitude for natural science, or for metaphysics, or for war. And some are interested in only one broad generalization, which exalts the white or more particularly the Nordic race, and groups all the other races together in one "tide of color." In his introduction to Mr. Stoddard's book, *The Rising Tide of Color,* Mr. Madison Grant sets forth this thesis:

If this great race [i.e., the Nordic] with its capacity for leadership and fighting should ultimately pass, with it would pass that which we call civilization. It would be succeeded by an unstable and bastardized population, where worth and merit would have no inherent right to leadership and among which a new and darker age would blot out our racial inheritance.

Such a catastrophe cannot threaten if the Nordic race will gather itself together in time, shake off the shackles of an inveterate altruism, discard the vain phantom of internationalism, and reassert the pride of race and the right of merit to rule.

The Nordic race has been driven from many of its lands, but still grasps firmly the control of the world, and it is certainly not at a greater numerical disadvantage than often before in contrast to the teeming population of eastern Asia.

It has repeatedly been confronted with crises where the accident of battle, or the genius of a leader, saved a well-nigh hopeless day. It has survived defeat, it has survived the greater danger of victory, and, if it takes warning in time, it may face the future with assurance. Fight it must, but let that fight be not a civil war against its own blood kindred but against the dangerous foreign races, whether they advance sword in hand or in the more insidious guise of beggars at our gates, pleading for admittance to share our prosperity.[1]

[1] Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color,* p. xxix f.

One would like to ask Mr. Grant what race has produced more "bastardized population" than the superior white race, and also why the principle of the inherent right of worth and merit and of the "right of merit to rule" is not valid in behalf of those men of colored races who exceed in worth and merit the vast majority of the white race.

Mr. Stoddard sees the decay of that white dominance over the other races which Mr. Grant appears to deem the racial right of the white people.

> The reader will remember [he says] how west-central Asia, which in the dawn of history was predominantly white man's country, is today racially brown man's land in which white blood survives only as vestigial traces of vanishing significance. If this portion of Asia, the former seat of mighty white empires and possibly the very homeland of the white race itself, should have so entirely changed its ethnic character, what assurance can the most impressive political panorama give us that the present world-order may not swiftly and utterly pass away?
>
> One thing is certain: the white man will have to recognize that the practically absolute world-dominion which he exercised during the nineteenth century can no longer be maintained.[1]

This is deemed a lamentable prospect, not because the principle of the domination of the other races by the white race is a wrong principle, but because the white race is no longer able, as the stronger race, to dominate, and the other races are no longer willing, as the inferior races, to be dominated.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

Over against the theories of this school other modern biologists and sociologists alike reject the notion of prescriptive race superiority. "The old idea of absolute stability of human types must evidently be given up," says Boas, "and with it the belief of the hereditary superiority of certain types over others." [1] "In vain," says Finot, "is the attempt made to endow certain privileged nations with every virtue by overwhelming their adversaries with condemnation to eternal inferiority!" [2] And Kidd says:

> It will materially help towards the solution of this and other difficult problems if we are in a position, as it appears we shall be, to say with greater clearness in the future than we have been able to do in the past, what it is constitutes superiority and inferiority of race. We shall probably have to set aside many of our old ideas on the subject. Neither in respect alone of colour, nor of descent, nor even of the possession of high intellectual capacity, can science give us any warrant for speaking of one race as superior to another. The evolution which man is undergoing is, over and above everything else, a social evolution. There is, therefore, but one absolute test of superiority. It is only the race possessing in the highest degree the qualities contributing to social efficiency that can be recognized as having any claim to superiority.[3]

In an article entitled, "Is Race Friction Between Blacks and Whites in the United States Growing and Inevitable," Mr. Stone, author of *Studies in the American Race Problem,* says:

[1] Boas, article on "Instability of Human Types," *Universal Races Congress,* 1911, p. 103.
[2] Finot, Jean, *Race Prejudice,* p. 316.
[3] Kidd, *The Control of the Tropics,* p. 97 f.

We have wasted an infinite amount of time in interminable controversies over the relative superiority and inferiority of different races. Such discussions have a certain value when conducted by scientific men in a purely scientific spirit. But for the purpose of explaining or establishing any fixed principle of race relations they are little better than worthless. . . . Only the white man writes volumes to establish on paper the fact of a superiority which is either self-evident and not in need of demonstration on the one hand, or is not a fact and is not demonstrable on the other. The really important matter is one about which there need be little dispute—the fact of racial differences. It is the practical question of differences—the fundamental differences of physical appearance, of mental habit and thought, of social customs and religious beliefs, of the thousand and one things keenly and clearly appreciable, yet sometimes elusive and undefinable—these are the things which at once create and find expression in what we call race problems and race prejudices, for want of better terms. In just so far as these differences are fixed and permanently associated characteristics of two groups of people, will the antipathies and problems between the two be permanent.[1]

The removal of these antipathies and the solution of these problems is the task for all men of reason and good-will today and especially of Christianity. It will help us on our way to examine a little further the idea of race superiority in the hope that hereafter we shall not waste such an "infinite amount of time" over it.

There are two races whose relations to the other races invariably arise in every discussion of the idea of race

[1] This article, published in the *American Journal of Sociology*, XIII (1907-8), pp. 677-696, has been adapted by Park and Burgess in *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, p. 632.

superiority. One is the Jew. The problem of the Jewish race will appear later. Here it will suffice to view it in one aspect alone. Do the Jews feel themselves to be a superior race? Mr. Belloc's book, *The Jews,* will be differently judged by different readers. To some it will seem thoroughly malicious. But probably his statement about the Jewish race mind is true:

> The Jew individually feels himself superior to his non-Jewish contemporary and neighbor of whatever race, and particularly of our race; the Jew feels his nation immeasurably superior to any other human community, and particularly to our modern national communities in Europe. . . . He reposes in the same confidence as was felt by Disraeli when he said: "The Jew cannot be absorbed; it is not possible for a superior race to be absorbed by an inferior." . . . But on his side, the Jew must recognize, however unpalatable to him the recognition may be, that those among whom he is living and whose inferiority he takes for granted, on their side regard him as something much less than themselves.
>
> It is clear that in this conflict between the Jew and, let us say, the European (for it is between the Jew and the white Occidental race that our present problem lies, though the same problem arises with all other races among whom the Jew may find himself) both parties cannot be right.[1]

Belloc suggests that a being superior to the race of man looking down might decide which party is right, but that failing such a decision our human solution must simply accept the fact that each party believes itself to be superior and "in the settlement they arrive

[1] Belloc, Hilaire, *The Jews,* pp. 108, 112, 116, 119.

at, admit as a factor necessarily and permanently present what each still secretly regards as a folly, but an incurable folly, in the other." [1] A better solution and the only possible one is to eschew all ideas of superiority and to recognize the fact of different and supplementary equipment for a common life and service.

The other race over which the issue of superiority or inferiority is most frequently raised or regarding which it is commonly assumed to be a closed issue is the Negro race. As the issue is presented by Mr. Kidd in *The Control of the Tropics,* it relates both to the Latin American and the African people. Are those races to be set down as prescriptively inferior? We shall consider the problem of both these races later, but now we ask only regarding the Negro. Is he to be dogmatically condemned to a status of race inferiority? Those who know the Negro race best in Africa do not admit it. M. Allegret cites the opinion of African administrators, General Sir F. G. Guggisberg, Governor of the Gold Coast, and General Mangin. The former says:

> If we provided natives with the means of getting a really first-rate education, would they be capable of taking their place alongside Europeans? I emphatically reply, "Yes, certainly." The reason of my affirmation is that many Africans have already attained to this, and that by their own efforts. . . . The day will come when the black race will have developed to such an extent that an irresistible movement will push the *élite* towards the higher ranges of education. It

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 119.

will be impelled by an instinctive thirst for knowledge and also by a desire to share in the direction of the social and political life of the masses.

General Mangin's opinion is as follows:

The African is quite capable of standing on his own feet. The steamers and trains are manned by natives who have been trained with remarkable rapidity. All our telegraph stations are in the hands of natives. The Negro is probably as competent as the white man to handle the scientific instruments of civilization. . . . I do not deny that he still has to be educated. What I do maintain is that he has qualities of head and heart which ought not to be treated as negligible. He is by nature good and faithful and endowed with a sense of honor, and if he is really given the chance, he will reach a high level. There is an *élite* in the black world capable of excelling in all regions of human intelligence. On the other hand, I do not in the least believe that if the black race is raised above its present position, there is any chance of its entering into conflict with the white race. It will take its place in the human family and will develop side by side and simultaneously with us.[1]

The United States Army psychological tests during the War found the relative racial capacity of the Negro lower than that of the white soldiers,[2] but let one of their own members, DuBois, as capable as any member of any race of stating the cause of racial justice, set forth the case against the notion of Negro racial inferiority:

It has often been assumed that the Negro is physically inferior to other races and markedly distinguishable from

[1] Allegret, Elie, Article on "The Present Crisis in Africa," *International Review of Missions*, April, 1923, p. 165.
[2] *National Academy of Science Memoirs*, Vol. XV, pp. 705-742.

them; modern science gives no authority for such an assumption. . . . Even if future measurement proves the average Negro brain lighter, the vast majority of Negro brain weights fall within the same limits as the whites; and finally, "neither size nor weight of the brain seems to be of importance" as an index of mental capacity. We may, therefore, say with Ratzel, "There is only one species of man. The variations are numerous, but do not go deep. . . ."

Let it therefore be said, once for all, that racial inferiority is not the cause of anti-Negro prejudice. Boas, the anthropologist, says, "An unbiased estimate of the anthropological evidence so far brought forward does not permit us to countenance the belief in a racial inferiority which would unfit an individual of the Negro race to take his part in modern civilization. We do not know of any demand made on the human body or mind in modern life that anatomical or ethnological evidence would prove to be beyond the powers of the Negro."

We have every reason to suppose that all races are capable, under proper guidance, of being fitted into the complex scheme of our modern civilization, and the policy of artificially excluding them from its benefits is as unjustifiable scientifically as it is ethically abhorrent.[1]

3. Errors in Racial Judgments

There are many errors which lie back of our ideas of race superiority.

[1] DuBois, *The Negro*, pp. 104-105, 139-140. See also article, "Some Recent Expressions on Racial Inferiority," by Robert Lowie in the *New Review*, Sept., 1914, p. 542; and in *The World Tomorrow*, March, 1922, article by H. A. Miller, "The Myth of Racial Inferiority." To quote from this article: "If both the culturally superior and inferior races will accept the fact that inherent racial inferiority is a myth, the world may be saved some of the painful experience it has suffered as the myths of privilege and prestige have been shattered."

(1) One is to assume the validity and supremacy of our own standards and to condemn to inferiority all non-conformity with those standards.

> The science of inequality [says Finot] is emphatically a science of white people. It is they who have invented it and set it going, who have maintained, cherished, and propagated it, thanks to *their* observations and *their* deductions. Deeming themselves greater than men of other colours, they have elevated into superior qualities all the traits which are peculiar to themselves, commencing with the whiteness of the skin and the pliancy of the hair. But nothing proves that these vaunted traits are traits of real superiority.[1]

We regard with favor certain physical characteristics —white skin, fair hair, blue eyes, a certain type of features, our own odors. Another race will naturally have entirely different tastes. It is a matter not of superiority or inferiority but of variety. "Some men say that colored people are 'ugly.' They should be reminded that beauty is very relative, and that our own idea of beauty is subject to changes of fashion. We know, too, that artists so refined as the Japanese find our large eyes and our high noses horrid." [2] In moral qualities we exalt energy, promptitude, exactness, veracity, readiness for progress, and so forth. These are good qualities, but, in the first place, are we sure that we individually possess them in sufficient measure to be entitled to racial self-satisfaction; and, in the second place, how shall we weigh them against the quali-

1 Finot, *Race Prejudice*, p. 310.
2 Von Luschan, Felix, *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, p. 14.

ties of patience, long-suffering, considerateness, contentment, which are possessed by other races in a measure beyond us? If we were to judge each race by its possession of the qualities exalted by Jesus, especially in the Beatitudes, which races would rank highest?

(2) A second error is the assumption that backwardness and inferiority are synonymous. "Backward," says Ratzel, "does not necessarily mean inferior."

The conception of child races is a familiar conception. Kidd says: "We have worked with it as a pretext in politics in relation to 'subject peoples' and to the questions of responsibility to weaker races, of the relations of the governing power to great systems of native jurisprudence and religion, which take us back to the very childhood of the world, and in which the first principle of successful policy is that we are dealing, as it were, with children." [1]

But we have not accepted this conception in its full application to race relationships. It is time that we should do so. A so-called inferior race is simply a race which has not yet enjoyed the education and felt the influences which would lift it to the level of its potential happiness and serviceableness. And in this sense all races are still inferior.

(3) A third error is the idea that the apparent inferiority of a race is due to its race character and destiny and not, as is the fact, to its lack of motive and opportunity and inspiration, although this lack is an effect as well as a cause of race character, that is,

[1] Kidd, *The Control of the Tropics*, p. 33 f.

inferiority of circumstances in a race's condition may be both cause and effect of inferiority of racial capacity. And it is of equal importance that the race which needs opportunity and inspiration should receive them and that the race which has them to give should impart them. A superior race that does not seek to share its superiority with an inferior will inevitably be dragged down to share the lower race's inferiority.[1]

(4) A more radical error is the idea of the fixedness of race character, of the fiat of unalterable race status. On the other hand, the truth is that there is no static, inherent, abiding status of race superiority or inferiority. No race is assured of continued ascendency. The alarmist school realizes this. Indeed this is the cry of terror it is sounding abroad. Having cherished the idea of white ascendency, it now sees that ascendency threatened, and, unconvinced of the right solution of the race problem, it is appealing for segregation and racial withdrawal and for the eugenic race breeding of the white peoples in the interest of the preservation of their superiority of race character. This truth of race growth and change is indeed a warning to all race vanity and privilege, but it is also the hope of all races, superior or inferior. None of them is doomed to a fixed status. A sound ethnological view is a confirmation of all the promises of Christianity to the races and to the men who comprise them.

(5) It is an error also to identify races and civilizations and to condemn as inferior the peoples of inferior

[1] *The South African Natives*, p. 186 f.

or backward culture. In the first place, our Western civilization is itself none too superior. To the extent that it embodies the truth which God has written upon nature and conforms to the mind of Christ it is true civilization. But in neither of these respects has it advanced far enough, and it is seamed with evils which are now so patent to the world that in condemning them there is danger that we may lose the essential values to which they are clinging. In the second place, so far as it is good, it is not ours. It is or is meant to be all men's universal possession. We ourselves have drawn heavily from others.

We need to remember our racial debt. It is too often assumed that our claimed racial superiority is our racial achievement. It is not so. "I am part of all that I have met" is more true of a race even than of a person. All generations and the races which preceded us and the races which surround us have helped to make and endow us. To any race conscious of its privilege, St. Paul puts his ancient question, "What hast thou that thou didst not receive?" [1]

Our own civilization [says Leroy Beaulieu] is not the monopoly of one race, but was constructed by the concurrence of many people. . . . The whole history of our civilization protests against its having ever been at any time monopolized by the Aryan branch of the white race. . . . The unity of race which has hitherto been imagined to exist among all Western peoples is now proved to be chimerical. . . . It

[1] Buckle, *History of Civilization in England*, Vol. I, Chap. II, on "Influence Exercised by Physical Laws over the Organization of Society, and over the Character of Individuals."

seems impossible with the present facts to sustain *a priori* that one race cannot assimilate the civilization of another.[1]

(6) We err also in our sweeping race judgments when we fasten all individuals of a race within a racial inheritance as though the generalized character which we give to the race holds each member of the race in its determinism. Thank God, it does nothing of the kind. Men of the so-called inferior races, not in exceptional cases but by the thousand, can be cited who transcend in character, culture, power, influence, usefulness, and humanity, members of the so-called superior races.

I have always been made sad [said Booker Washington] when I have heard members of any race claiming rights and privileges, or certain badges of distinction, on the ground simply that they were members of this or that race, regardless of their own individual worth or attainments. I have been made to feel sad for such persons because I am conscious of the fact that mere connection with what is known as a superior race will not permanently carry an individual forward unless he has individual worth, and mere connection with what is regarded as an inferior race will not finally hold an individual back if he possesses intrinsic, individual merit. Every persecuted individual and race should get much consolation out of the great human law, which is universal and eternal, that merit, no matter under what skin found, is, in the long run, recognized and rewarded. This I have said here, not to call attention to myself as an individual, but to the race to which I am proud to belong.[2]

1 Beaulieu, *The Awakening of the East*, p. 172. See Anesaki, *The Religious and Social Problems of the Orient*, Chap. III.
2 Washington, Booker T., *Up From Slavery*, p. 40 f.

Fair and just men of all races are coming to realize this, even though more slowly than Booker Washington's hopeful words imply. And none are leading in this righteous and creative way of treating the race problems more wisely and efficiently than the best white men and women in the South. At the Southern Sociological Congress in Atlanta in 1913 Professor Josiah Morse of the University of South Carolina said:

The Negro is a human being, and modern anthropology has shown that the differences among human beings—anatomical, physiological, and mental—are insignificant as compared with their fundamental resemblances and identities. We shall certainly not need a Negro science of medicine. The things that breed disease among the whites—poverty, ignorance, overcrowding, immorality, alcoholism, insanitary premises, neglect and malnutrition of children—will breed disease with equal facility among the Negroes. And we may rest assured that the measures and remedies that prevent and cure diseases among the whites will do the same for the blacks.

And what is true of the body in this respect is also true of the mind. The conditions that make for morality or immorality, for happiness or unhappiness, for love and hate, sympathy and antipathy, kindness and cruelty, among the whites accomplish the same results for the blacks. We shall not need a separate psychology for the Negroes, nor a separate logic, ethics, sociology, economics; not even a separate religion or art. The laws and facts of human nature discovered by these various sciences are equally true of the colored races of man as of the white. Science knows no essential distinctions, because nature knows none. And that is why, in my opinion, our problem is not nearly so difficult as it might be, or as it appears to some. We know the es-

sential facts and conditions; we know that everything human, from culture to disease, is intercommunicable among the races of men; we know that the foundation stones upon which this universe rests are righteousness and justice, and honesty and love; we know that injustice cannot be done with impunity to the doer, that it must be paid for with compound interest and at an exorbitant rate; we know that no problem can be permanently solved unless it be solved fairly and in a generous spirit; we know that the Negro is here to stay, and that our welfare and happiness and health and progress are inextricably interwoven with his—then let us teach these truths honestly and fearlessly. . . . In this way, I believe, we shall most speedily and effectively rid our social system of the poisons of prejudice which are now causing so much suffering and loss to both races; and in this way we shall lay the foundation, at least, for the satisfactory solution of the problem in the future.[1]

4. Four Conclusions

This examination of the idea of race superiority has not been made under a presupposition of theoretical race equality of any kind, nor has it touched the nature, characteristics, and qualifications of the idea of racial equality which have emerged. Questions of political, economic, or social equality are not as yet under discussion. Our review has had four things in mind: (1) the dissolution of that prejudice against any race which may become the cause of its racial discouragement, and which implies the assumption that it or its members are barred from any of the achievements or

[1] Quoted in *The South Mobilizing for Social Service*, edited by J. E. McCulloch, p. 403 f.

possessions of humanity; (2) the affirmation of the truth of a general equality in racial gifts; one gift differeth from another, one race from another, yet all may contribute with equal faithfulness to human progress; (3) the emergence of the duty of service as the one real evidence and privilege of race superiority; (4) the reassertion from a larger point of view of the truth of human unity. Let us note each of these points.

(1) Some students of the race problems see an approach toward its solution in the recognition of their inferiority by the races deemed inferior.

Mr. Stone says:

> Open manifestations of [race] antipathy will be aggravated if each group feels its superiority over the other. They will be fewer and milder when one race accepts the position of inferiority outwardly or really feels the superiority of the other. . . . The most complex relation possible between any two racial groups is that of a theoretical equality which one race denies and the other insists upon. The accepted relation of superior and inferior may exist not only without bitterness on one side or harsh feelings upon the other, but it may be characterized by a sentiment and affection wholly impossible between the same groups under conditions demanding a recognition of so-called equality.[1]

The difficulties in the way of this solution are probably insurmountable. The acceptance of a status of inferiority is both good and bad for a man. It may be both better and worse for a race. The acceptance of a destined limit to progress is the surest deterrent to

[1] Stone, *Studies in the American Race Problem*, pp. 219, 223.

progress, and the abandonment of the hope of progress is death to man and races alike. Furthermore, individuals of the race which is invited to accept inferiority, who are themselves on a level with the superior individuals of the superior race, are psychologically incapable of submergence in the racial menialism proposed for them, and the interests of the society to which they and the superior race alike belong will not be likely to acquiesce in the situation that would be produced.[1] Moreover, the world into which we have come or are coming is sure to be so convinced that human solidarity is a stronger principle than race,—while both principles are recognized as essential and valid,—that it is certain that some other racial adjustment than that of race aristocracy will have to be found. Before we finish these studies, we must try to find such an adjustment.

(2) The present extent of our knowledge of ethnology leads students to minimize the difference in capacity between races. Professor John Dewey says:

[1] Might not the point be made that an admission of inferiority is not necessarily discouraging if it is felt to exist in regard to certain qualities only? For instance, Italians may admit that in the matter of height and physical strength they are, on an average, inferior to Anglo-Saxons. That would not discourage them. In the same way, Americans may admit that they are less artistic than the Japanese; Hindus that they are less musical than Italians; Russians that they are less logical than the French. A mutual recognition of specific racial or national superiorities and inferiorities, without attempts to formulate any general theory of superiority or inferiority might lead to greater admiration of all races towards each other, and to greater efforts on the part of each further to perfect itself in the qualities in which it already excels and to make good, in so far as that is possible, the felt failings or handicaps in racial or national character and abilities.—Bruno Lasker.

"Careful study has made it doubtful whether their [savages'] native capacities are appreciably inferior to those of civilized men. It has made it certain that native differences are not sufficient to account for the difference in culture."

Professor Robert E. Park, of the University of Chicago, says:

The difference between a savage and a civilized man is not due to any fundamental differences in their brain cells but to the connections and mutual stimulations which are established by experience and education between those cells. In the savage those possibilities are not absent, but latent. In the same way the difference between the civilization of Central Africa and that of Western Europe is due, not to the difference in native abilities of the individuals and the peoples who have created them, but rather to the form which the association and interaction between those individuals and groups of individuals has taken.

Professor Franz Boas, head of the Anthropological Department of Columbia University, writes:

The differences between different types of man, are, on the whole, small as compared to the range of variation in each type. . . . We are not inclined to consider the mental organization of different races of man as differing in fundamental points. Although, therefore, the distribution of faculty among the races of man is far from being known, we can say this much: the average faculty of the white race is found to the same degree in a large proportion of individuals of all other races, and although it is probable that some of these races may not produce as large a proportion of great men as our own race, there is no reason to suppose that they

are unable to reach the level of civilization represented by the bulk of our own people.[1]

The facts as we now know them, however, do not involve more than the idea of a general equality of racial capacity, and the doctrine of human solidarity implies no more. The average ability of some races is below that of other races. These "lower" races may have some compensating capacities which the stronger races lack but the net balance may be heavy on the "upper" side. And yet in the fulfilment of the whole life of humanity, the capacities of each race and of all may be equally essential.

There is much that we do not yet know. But we know enough to take home to ourselves some important lessons which Professor Fleming draws out in his paper on "Relative Racial Capacity":

One is *that we should not think of ourselves more highly than we ought to think.* There should be a certain wholesome humility. This is a lesson that the Anglo-Saxon especially ought to take to heart. It is very easy for the white race to assume its superiority as a matter of course, and to do without thinking a multitude of little things which rankle harmfully in the hearts of another people. . . . Just as we have given up the idea of the divine right of kings, and are giving up the age-long conception of male superiority, we will very likely have to give up the flattering delusion of decided racial superiority.

We can see, also, *the right of each person to be treated as an individual and not classed in a group.* . . . We forget that

[1] Quoted by D. J. Fleming in an article on "Relative Racial Capacity," in *International Review of Missions,* Jan., 1923, p. 116.

when we talk about the characteristics of a race as a whole, we are dealing with an abstraction that has no existence in nature. . . . If we were wishing to select a hundred people who are to be quite superior to another hundred, one of the most foolish ways would be to choose them by race. Selecting one hundred persons at random from one race supposedly superior, would by no means give you a group uniformly superior to another hundred chosen at random from a supposedly inferior race. . . . *The selection of leadership by means of race alone would be a very inefficient method of procedure.* . . .

This discussion may make us *more ready to see the good in another people.* . . . Lastly, the present stage of psychological tests should give us great *confidence that, given the right sort of training, we can find in any group the leadership it needs.*[1]

(3) There is one way in which it is open to any race to affirm and demonstrate its superiority and that is in its humble and unselfish service of other races, by simply perfecting to the highest degree its innate qualities of excellence, by maintaining a character for moral rectitude and purity, and by helping other races on their upward way.

"In the long run," as Professor Conklin has said, "supremacy will pass in every community, nation, or race to the more intelligent, the more capable, the more ethical. . . . In this struggle of races and peoples, there is reason to believe that success will ultimately rest with the intelligent, the capable, and the attention of all who love their race should be centred upon raising the

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 117-120.

standards of heredity, of education, and of social ideals." [1]

"My only fear for white supremacy," writes a great-spirited Southern woman, "is that we should prove unworthy of it. If we fail there, we shall pass. Supremacy is for service. It is suicide to thrust other races back from the good which we hold in trust for humanity. For him who would be greatest the price is still that he shall be servant of all." [2]

(4) Let us return again to the fundamental thought of the unity of all races in the one race. And let us end this chapter with two noble assertions of it.

One is an affirmation of faith in human unity based on the evidence of human speech and the intercommunication of which men of the most diverse races are capable. In an essay on "Language as a Link," Professor Smith, Waynflete Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy at Oxford, writes avowing this faith as follows:

. . . that mankind constitutes a real unity, that there is an identity of nature running through and present in all mankind. This is not, or not merely, a natural unity. It does not lie in, or arise from, singleness of ancestry or kinship of blood; it is not merely the result of historic accident or physical causes. I cannot think of it as less than a spiritual unity which can neither be produced nor destroyed from without. All men can say "We" with a truth and significance incommunicable to other beings than men; they share in a

1 Conklin, *The Direction of Human Evolution*, p. 45 f. See also Guizot, *History of Civilization*, Chap. I, p. 11.
2 Hammond, L. H., *In Black and White*, p. 89.

complex but single type of experience. And with this goes a mutual or reciprocal communion in which no other beings participate; they are all literally one with one another.[1]

The other word is by Mr. F. S. Marvin:

A dangerous frame of mind has often prevailed in the past, and is naturally feared by good people in the present, a consciousness of progress by those who share it, with pride of place and a claim to overlordship in the interests of the overlord and the detriment of others. The danger is real; such ill-used strength has wrought devastation for centuries, but is by no means inherent in the enlightened consciousness of progress or power. It is power without enlightenment and without responsibility that works evil and may ruin a race as it has often ruined a family. The enlightenment needed here concerns the source of Western power; the responsibility arises from any fair consideration of its proper use. We are ready to say that the West must be trustee for the rest of mankind; this book, in fact, sets out to be a variation on that theme. But such sound and high doctrine needs for its full force the realization of the social and historic truth on which it rests. The West should be the world-trustee, not because of any inherent right, still less because of its temporary power, but because the riches and resources which it holds have come to it, directly or indirectly, at near or far remove, from the whole race of man. The gifts of Humanity all Humanity must enjoy and thrive on, or it will be impoverished and decay, including the vanguard which has, at the moment, the largest share.

If this seems merely the language of exhortation, describing rather an ideal laid up in heaven than the possibilities of a sinful world, it will be well to consider how profound is the common basis of all human culture, how deep the debt of the most advanced sections of mankind to all their prede-

[1] Smith, J. A., in *Western Races and the World*, p. 30 f.

cessors, perhaps most of all to the earliest and simplest. Art, numeration, all the most indispensable inventions, fire, the wheel, the loom, the bow, the knife, are due to races of mankind struggling against natural hardships which we soft Westerners can now barely imagine, and certainly with their equipment could never face. These men, were they now alive, would rank with the most backward of existing races.

Let us now look at our problem in the light of this historical perspective, which anthropology has opened up to us in recent years. Our first analogy was that of a family, and we shall find that we come back to that as the nearest and most helpful guide. All the races of mankind, in view of their common origin and common qualities, may be regarded as one family, with one home and one Father, however we may conceive that greatest and highest of Beings who embraces and sustains us.

We, therefore, as one family, owe affection and service to one another, and all of us feel and recognize this tie according to our powers of sympathy and understanding. But like all analogies, this one is not complete; there is something less on the one side, and something more on the other. The family of nations is far less united by love and constant association, and the various members in too many cases have never even heard of one another. But, on the other hand, there is something more in the wider relation which history and sociology have lately revealed to us.

Every member in the great family, even the strongest and most advanced, owes the essentials of social life to races of men similar in civilization to those whom we now regard as backward, and whom we are called upon, as our kindred, to help on their upward path.[1]

[1] Marvin, F. S., in *Western Races and the World*, pp. 14-16.

CHAPTER III

The Good and Gain of Race and Race Distinction

1. Our Race is Our Mother

In the rich imagery of four of the Prophets the Hebrew race is spoken of as "mother"—Isaiah 50:1; Jeremiah 50:12; Ezekiel 19:2, 10; Hosea 2:4; 4:5. It is significant that in each passage where this noble metaphor is used the race is held up to reprobation and reproach for its shortcomings and transgressions. It is as though the Prophets sought to bring out in the degradation and misuse of race the ideal of its honor and glory. A man's race was his mother. What more glorious tribute could be paid to its true nature and significance? This is a good conception for us today. A man should feel and act with regard to his race as he would with regard to his mother. He would defend her from any assault of word or deed. He would never endure from others and he would never tolerate from himself one word of slander or disrespect regarding her. He would never do or allow to be done in her name or in her alleged interest any mean or dishonorable thing. He would act toward the mothers of other men as he would wish them to act toward his own. The world and the world's history would be different if men had always spoken and acted with regard to all

races, their own and others, in this conception of motherhood, and it would be a long step today toward the solution of the race problem if we would always speak of race as a man would speak of his own and of another man's mother. Such a way of looking at race would dispose at once of all race shame, secrecy, disrespect, or contempt.

The manly spirit of race respect, devoid of all boasting on one side and of all sycophancy on the other, is more and more characterizing each race and ought to characterize it. It is or ought to be just as proud a distinction for a Chinese to be a Chinese, or an African an African, as for a Frenchman to be a Frenchman or an American an American. While it may be true that "no race can work toward its perfection except in the assumption that there is no task in the world which it may not be called upon to perform," nevertheless, it may also be held that each race has a work to do in the world for itself and for all races which no other race can do. To be born into any race, to be a worthy member of it, lifting it to its true character and its true duty, is glory and honor for any man.

2. Race Enriches Humanity

The existence of races gives richness and variety to humanity. In any one section of mankind, whether race or family, it is a good thing that the individuals are not all alike. So also of all mankind. St. Paul wrote nineteen centuries ago a great declaration of the

unity and variety of humanity. It is a noble biological conception of the ideal society pictured in the conception of the Church as an organism. It is found in I Corinthians 12: 4-27. This is the greatest utterance in all literature on the race problem. The diversity of humanity is essential to its health and life and glory. As the Southern white woman who has been already quoted, and who is one of those seeking really to apply the Christian spirit to the race problem, writes:

> Life does not develop towards uniformity, but towards richness of variety in a unity of beauty and service. Unless the Race of Man contradicts all known laws of life it will develop in the same way; and whether white, or yellow, or black, they who guard their own racial integrity, in a spirit of brotherhood free from all other-racial scorn, will most truly serve the Race to which all belong. What we white people need to lay aside is not our care for racial separateness, but our prejudice. The black race needs, in aspiring to the fullest possible development, to foster a fuller faith in its own blood, and in the world's need for some service which it, and it alone, can render in richest measure to the great Brotherhood of Man.[1]

The effort of races to fulfil themselves and to achieve what other races have achieved, and to attain a rational self-adequacy in a spirit of service and not of isolation is a wholesome and enlarging moral discipline for men as individuals and for human society. It is beyond the scope of our study to consider the relation of the conception of the solidarity of the human race to such

[1] Hammond, *In Black and White*, p. 44.

economic problems as the question of free trade and protection. Either theory is reconcilable with the unity of human society if it is so conceived and followed, and if it is practiced in the ultimate interest of all mankind; although the theory of free trade may be held to be presumptively the truer theory for a really unified world. But in a world so imperfectly unified as ours and compelled to operate by the device of distinct races and nationalities, and providentially subjected to the education of such operations for rich and justifying ends,—in such a world the duty of each race to perfect itself and to seek a full equipment for its racial task is a duty whose fulfilment is good for each race and for all races. A movement like the Swadeshi, or home industry movement of India, or Swaraj, or home rule, is at bottom a right and wholesome movement.

It is a good thing for each race and for all the world that there has not been any dead level of racial attainment, but that all have had to struggle together and with various measures of speed in their achievement and against various forms of difficulty and hindrance. May not the richness and sternness of each race's struggle for self-realization, if its spirit is pure of hatred or false pride, make only the larger its contribution to the whole life of humanity?

3. Racial Self-determination and Pride

Just as racial effort and economic self-dependence is a good thing for the world, so is the desire and struggle

for racial self-determination. We were made very familiar with the idea of the self-determination of peoples by the discussions of the war period. But the conception did not then come into being for the first time. We must not wince today when reminded of its explicit avowal in the Declaration of Independence concerning governments "deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed . . . whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends (i.e., the securing of the rights of equality, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness) it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness." If these were true principles for us in 1776, why are they not true principles for all men always?

Before the war made the phrase "race autonomy" cosmopolitan, a speaker at the Universal Races Congress dealt with the subject dispassionately, with a view to pointing out the race-gain of the idea that no race is barred from freedom and power by any fiat of racial incapacity. The unrest of races subjected to domination from without he conceived to be a good and inevitable thing:

> All history proclaims the lesson. Whether we take ancient despots ruling empires through satraps, or States playing the despot to other States, the sequence is infallibly evil. Never is there any continuity of sound life. In the absence of control from the governed, the despotisms invariably grew

corrupt and feeble. . . . The contemporary problem may be put in a nutshell. Are the subject races of today progressing, or not? If yes, they must be on the way, however slowly, to a measure of self-government. If not, the domination of the advanced races is a plain failure; and the talk of "beneficent rule" becomes an ideal hypocrisy. The only possible alternative thesis is that the subject races are incapable of progress; and this is actually affirmed by some imperialists who reason that only in "temperate climates" do the natural conditions essential to self-government subsist. Their doctrine may be left to the acceptance of all who can find ground for exultation and magniloquence in the prospect of a perpetual dominion of white men over cowed colored races who secretly and helplessly hate them. . . . The perpetual absence of every element of political self-determination from a people's life means a failure of civilization. . . . It would seem that a first step towards a scientific or even a quasi-rational view of the problem must be to put aside the instinctive hypothesis that faculty for self-government is a matter of "race." [1]

And the working out of this problem of reasonable and ethical and fiduciary autonomy by each race for itself and with any help, if possible, from the "stronger" races to the "weaker," is a school of humanity wherein all men are meant to learn lessons of self-control, of kindness, and of truth. The problem is infinitely difficult. Human races do not move collectively. There are always more progressive nations which cannot wait for the patient education of the mass, and there are always in every race men who seek their own interests or the supposed interests

[1] Robertson, John M., M.P., on "The Rationale of Autonomy," in *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, pp. 41-44.

of their race above the interests of humanity, and back of all moral deficiencies lie our mutual incapacities, our want of sympathy and imagination, of power to judge causes and forces and foresee consequences and effects. Men and races are simply unequal to the tasks they have to deal with. But the acknowledgment of this and the humble desire to work with God in the making of humanity are genuine benefits of the institution of race, outweighing its evils. It is part of this education that "strong" races must surmount their appetite for dominion and "weak" races transcend their servility. Only this cannot be done, as many of the young men of India seem to think it can, by denouncing the "slave mentality" of their race and reproaching the influence of British rule in India which is alleged to have crushed out the freedom of the Indian soul. It can only be done by disproving that freedom has been crushed out and by displaying, not a servile, but a noble and human mind. Races rise to their own place not by making claims or bemoaning errors but by achieving work and by rendering service, and on this road no hindrances are insurmountable. Other races cannot raise them or make them free. Each race must do these things for itself. No man can give another man his independence. The first man can disclaim responsibility for the second, but if the second man is to be self-dependent, only he can achieve it. Mr. Stone states a universal truth about races and men when he says: "When the friend of the Negro masses would know the whole truth behind the forces which

today most militate against the material progress of the race, he must go deep below the surface of troubles which the white man can remove or rectify." [1]

The white race can do much, far more than it has yet done, to help other races, but in the same sense for races as for men, God bids us to work out our own salvation. And may it not be that He made races that He might save us with a yet greater salvation?

Just as every man has a proper and righteous pride in his mother, so every man ought to have a just and ennobling pride in his race. It would be hard to find a more worthy illustration of such pride, at once humble, modest, and exalted, than Booker Washington's *Up from Slavery*. A manly race spirit breathes from every page of that book from the first paragraph to the last.

Such a man's pride in his race makes the race more worthy of pride. And often the proud spirit of a race will hold up a man who would have fallen if he had rested on personal pride or self-respect alone, but whom his race consciousness made strong. The pride of loyalty to the best moral ideals of one's race and of fidelity to its traditions is a worthy and uplifting pride. If better moral ideals than these appear and if the old traditions are found to be at variance with truth, it is a man's duty to abandon the racial grooves, but this is only to say again that race is a great principle but that humanity is greater and that its parts only fulfil their mission as they come together in the whole.

[1] Stone, *Studies in the American Race Problem*, p. 147.

It is a good thing for mankind to have the discipline of the duty of rising from race prejudice and ignorance to a higher level of interracial knowledge and sympathy. There is even in many of the best men of the modern world a strange insularity and want of world view and of race insight which needs this discipline.

Part of the discipline of spirit which a true world feeling involves is the conquest of race partisanship. Men must learn how to have a true race pride without contempt or effrontery or false assumption toward other races. An American writer says, "The superiority of a race cannot be preserved without pride of blood and an uncompromising attitude toward the lower races," and he proceeds to contrast the dedication of the United States and Canada to the highest type of civilization while Latin America "for centuries will drag the ball and chain of hybridism." [1]

Another American writer applies these words with approval to the attitude of the white to the black race in the United States. Yet elsewhere he realizes that no hopeful and happy solution of race problems or of human life is possible on the basis of such an attitude of mind: "The essence of the race problem is that of the peaceful common occupancy of the same territory by two widely differing people. Whatever builds up amicable relations between the tenants in common tends to minimize the problem of their tenancy. Whatever tends to create friction between them makes their problem more acute." [2]

[1] *Ibid.*, Ross, E. A., quoted on p. 241. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 251.

The race problem needs to be considered in vastly broader outlines than these. It is not a question of common tenancy of America. It is a question of common tenancy of a world which is smaller and more interdependent than America once was. But the conditions of the solution are the same—"amicable relations." There can be no amicable relations without mutual respect and common justice and a discontinuance of the practice of leveling individual persons down or up to a group mass irrespective of personal character and capacity. The variety of races is provided, perhaps, to afford us all a school in which to develop this larger human view of man.

The discontent of single races and the general unrest of all races are signs of life. Mr. Putnam Weale, who is among the color-terrorists, sees clearly the inevitableness and, on the whole, the good of all racial aspirations and expansions. He deplores the failure of the Western peoples to realize the significance of the universal spread of knowledge.

> The world influence of this new growth [he says] and its really vast significance are still so utterly unappreciated that the political and social unrest which this new knowledge necessarily brings in its train (in China and India, just as much as in Portugal and Spain) is attributed to the masses becoming infected with anarchistic ideas—that is, to their blind devotion to destructive and not to constructive principles—whereas, if the truth be known, so far from such being a true statement of the case, since masses no more than individuals do not willingly court destruction, this commotion is merely the sign that knowledge—with its accom-

panying conviction that political salvation lies within the grasp of all—is reaching the most widely separated peoples. . . .

When Asia is as universally educated as Europe is today [he adds] it will be time to know that almost every old assumption regarding this great region must be modified. Gulfs which seemed unbridgeable will have been quietly bridged overnight; and thus it will come about that dawn will find those who have not prepared themselves for such changes unable to adjust their views and still weakly talking of conspiracies and revolutions, when what they are witnessing will be nothing but the natural evolution of the human race.[1]

This is a necessary movement and a desirable goal. The whole race has a common interest in the success of the movement and the attainment of the goal. In this movement race servility is ever more and more clearly seen as an evil. The spirit of self-respecting and self-forgetful service should control every race, and the spirit of servility be found in none.

The excesses to which some races carry the spirit of racial revolt and self-assertion must not lead us to condemn the sense of racial self-respect and the desire for racial personality. Mr. Gandhi and the Nationalist Movement in India may have erred, but their error was a mixture with good. The impossibility of their program must not be allowed to hide the right spirit of longing for racial integrity and dignity. The whole world will be better for the peaceful effort of men to find a better balance between the forces of rest and the forces of change than we have thus far achieved.

[1] Weale, B. L. Putnam, *The Conflict of Color*, pp. 13-14, 18.

4. Economic Interdependence of Races

Variety of production and freedom of interchange are the sources of the world's wealth and prosperity. The existence of a diversity of races adapted to the conditions and climates of all parts of the world and capable of producing all that can be produced is an indispensable means to the widest human welfare. No reasonable person is able any longer to dispute the economic unity and interdependence of mankind, or to question that one of the most important tasks in the world is to bring the races into such right thoughts and relationships to one another as shall lead them to realize their mutual dependence and to work out in the fullest measure the benefits which God meant mankind to derive from it. Sociologists and economists must increasingly concern themselves with this subject.

Kidd says:

> It must be remembered that it is in an interchange of commodities between these regions and those at present occupied by the European peoples that it is possible to have permanently operative, on the largest scale upon which it could be made operative in the world, the great natural principle underlying all trade; i.e., that the interchange of products between peoples and regions possessing different natural capacities tends to be mutually advantageous.[1]

Kidd was concerned to expound what he conceived to be the right principle of race relationships in the matter of the development of the undeveloped areas

[1] Kidd, *The Control of the Tropics*, p. 14 f.

of the world. He deplored the gloomy spectacle of the nineteenth century, the domination by Europe, under a wrong economic and social policy, of a tropical area larger than Europe itself, a "railing off of immense regions in the tropics under the policy which has suggested their acquirement, regions tending, in the absence of white colonists, to simply revert to the type of States worked for gain, and slowly but surely surrounding themselves with a wall of laws and tariffs operating in favor of the European Power in possession, to the exclusion of the interests of the rest of the world." [1] The impossibility of allowing great areas of the earth to lie fallow or unproductive was obvious to Kidd, as it was obvious to everyone in the days before the war, when the consuming power of the nations seemed to threaten a great excess over their power of production and when the advantageous possibilities of world-wide trade seemed to be unlimited. These developments have been retarded by the war and by its colossal destruction of human power both to produce and to consume, but this retardation has been offset, in a small measure at least, in its effects upon the increase of the intimacy of race relations by the unprecedented increase of that intimacy in the associations, both military and economic, which the war brought about.

We see far more clearly now than before the war the absolute indissolubility of all human interests and the inevitable economic unity of the world. The world was aware of the fact before, but it miscalculated both its

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 31 f.

strength and its weakness. It believed that the financial interdependence of the nations, "the peace of Dives," as Mr. Kipling described it, would hold the nations together. It was an empty faith. Not even certain financial ruin can prevent war, and, taken alone, it ought not to. On the other hand, men had no conception of the indissolubility of the commercial solidarity of mankind. They did not realize that the economic life of the world had become an organic unity and that if any nation should fall, all must feel the downpull. Even yet many men will not believe it. They talk in the old language of "trade war," as though the ancient Shibboleths were any longer true. Trade war is trade suicide in a unified world. The nation that injures other nations in trade conflict simply injures itself. If a man gashes his leg with his hand, the hand shares in the loss and suffering. And it is so in humanity. In the development and distribution of raw material, in the interchange of goods, in the use of credits, the interest of one is the interest of all, and the interest of all is the interest of each. Any other doctrine and the practice of it will bring their own judgment with them. The malefactors who are immediately guilty may figure up only profit, but time and facts will reckon with their children. The truth is the only profitable economic theory, and the truth is that the economic interest of humanity is indivisible. The war which was the greatest economic schism ever known has demonstrated this principle of unity.

The white races need the products of the other races

and they need equally the markets which the other races afford for the products of the white races. Originally it was the need of products which led to exploration and trade and conquest. But in later years it became the need of markets, and Mr. Stoddard's case for white supremacy includes the need and duty of the white race to dominate, if it can, in industry.

I showed [he says] the profound effect of the "industrial revolution" in furthering white world-supremacy, and I pointed out the tremendous advantages accruing to the white world from exploitation of undeveloped colored lands and from exports of manufactured goods to colored markets. The prodigious wealth thereby amassed has been a prime cause of white prosperity, has buttressed the maintenance of white world-hegemony, and has made possible much of the prodigious increase of white population.

We realize what the loss of these advantages would mean. As a matter of fact, it would mean throughout the white world diminished prosperity, lessened political and military strength, and such relative economic and social stagnation as would depress national vigor and check population. It is even possible to visualize a white world reverting to the condition of Europe in the fifteenth century—thrown back upon itself, on the defensive, and with a static rather than a progressive civilization. Such conditions could, of course, occur only as the result of colored military and industrial triumphs of the most sweeping character. But the possibility exists, nevertheless, as I shall endeavor to show.[1]

And he proceeds to describe the disaster of an awakened industrial life among the "colored" races which would threaten the industrial supremacy of the white world.

[1] Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color*, p. 240 f.

In truth, of course, selling and buying are inseparable, for nations are able to purchase only as they can pay, and they can only pay, not in money, but in products or possessions of their own taken in exchange. A producing race selling forever to non-producing races is an economic myth. The wealth of all races depends upon increased and continuous intercourse and exchange, from which all shall profit alike and in a real sense equally. To the extent that any race shares unequally, its power to continue the intercourse to the profit of itself and of the other races is impaired. The world is made up of many races because economically the existence of many races, adapted to and capable of the development of all parts of the world, may be a gain to all.

It is a further gain to humanity that in working out our interracial problems the races are under the necessity of being always on their guard morally lest they injure or retard each other. The danger of injuring other races is one of the evils of race. The new strength and virtue which arise from overcoming this danger are among the blessings which flow from race. The East has its well-grounded fear of the spread of individualism, with its evil features, and of the impoverishment and exploitation of the other races by the white race. The white race can find in the most real temptation to which it has been exposed in this regard, and to which it has succumbed a chance for the same kind of moral victory and enlargement which comes to the individual.

Whence comes temptation
But to meet and master
And make crouch beneath the feet,
And so be pedestalled
In triumph?

5. *The Contributions of the Races*

The supreme gain of the institution of race, however, and the divine purpose in its establishment according to St. John's great conception, is the development through the special experience and achievement of each race, of moral character-values which are to be the race's contribution to the common human stock. Separation of race was certainly one of the conditions which made possible the development of religion among the Hebrews, of art among the Greeks, and of law among the Romans. This religion, art, and law are the common possession of humanity now. All the races are in a vast school. Out of it at the last they are to come into the one City of God bringing their treasures with them. This was St. John's sublime vision:

"And the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb. And the races shall walk amidst the light thereof: and the kings of the earth bring their glory into it. And the gates thereof shall in no wise be shut by day (for there is no night there): and they shall bring the glory and the honor of the races into it: and there shall in no wise enter into it any thing unclean, or he that maketh an

abomination and a lie: but only they that are written in the Lamb's book of life." [1]

Can we discern at all the values which God is working out for man in the experience and character of the races? The missionary movement has been studying this question with interest for a hundred years. It has approached it from two points of view. First, what are the qualities of character in the non-Christian races which can be welcomed and used in the universal Church of Christ which, as one body, is in its ideal the hope and promise and norm of a united humanity? Second, what values in Christianity are brought into clearer light, or perhaps for the first time discovered, by the application of the gospel to the demands and capacities of the non-Christian peoples? What have they to add not to Christ, but to our apprehension of the fulness which is in Christ and which no one race can apprehend alone?

The volume entitled *Mankind and the Church* is a collection of studies by missionary bishops of the Church of England, which they describe as "An Attempt to Estimate the Contribution of Great Races to the Fulness of the Church of God."

(a) The Papuan race of the South Seas is dealt with as representative of the primitive races. Its weaknesses are described as impurity, untruthfulness, and callousness; and its virtues as generosity, domestic affection, patience, and sense of justice; and the contribution of this child race is held to be (1) consciousness of the

[1] Rev. 21: 23-27.

unseen, (2) simplicity of faith and life, (3) corporate spirit, (4) faithfulness.

Is there not [concludes the Bishop of New Guinea] a message from the Papuan to inform the white race? The world of modern life is a stern battleground of competition and a ceaseless struggle for existence. The race tends to harden under its influence. Then, as it extends beyond white lands and reaches the rich islands of the Pacific with their balmy air and soft zephyrs, it passes, as it were, from the place of business to the playground and the nursery, and the hard nature, the unimpassioned spirit, comes into contact with native races simple in habits, unselfish in heart, and unassertive in disposition. It is as though Christ takes, as of old, a little child, and sets him in the midst and draws out lessons for the grown-up disciples. The passive virtues are wonderfully revealed in the Papuan who is growing in grace. In his gentleness, unselfishness, patience, good temper, this bright child of nature displays many of the elements that make up the Perfect Life.[1]

(b) The African race is considered for the most part in *Mankind and the Church* in its characteristics when Christianized, and rather in the African and West Indian habitat than in the United States, and the emphasis is on the race's contribution to the Church rather than to general social values. Archbishop Nuttall of the West Indies concludes:

The subjects, the habits of thought, and the modes of action in which the Christianity of the Negro race will, to a considerable degree, affect the sum total of Christianity in the future, may be stated under the following heads:

[1] *Mankind and the Church*, p. 68.

(1) Realizing the personality of God and the objectivity of divine manifestation. Cheerful acceptance of all providential arrangements as the acts of a wise and loving God. Old Testament religion in a Christian form.

(2) The emotional element generally in the presentation of truth, and the experimental realizing of it.

(3) Musical tastes of a particular kind, and the emotional expression of religious ideas in music, in song, and in worship.

(4) The social element. The sense of brotherhood in the Church. Taking an active personal share in the services of public worship, and in the actual work of the Church. Supporting the Church financially. Community in service and sympathy in affliction and sorrow as well as in joy.

(5) A strong appreciation of the authority of the Church, and recognition of the value of its disciplinary arrangements.[1]

The last point rests on the conviction that

. . . the Negro has a strong appreciation of the authority of law. This manifests itself in civil affairs. He not only makes a loyal subject, but readily admits his responsibility to obey the law of the land. Even in things in which he fails to obey, he does not dispute the authority, but makes the best excuses he can for his non-obedience.[2]

(c) The contributions of the Japanese race, Bishop Awdry is convinced, are fundamental:

Three broad characteristics stand out, distinct yet intimately connected with each other—characteristics which belong to the very foundations of Japanese ideals, and to the

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 113.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 110.

very ground tints of the characters of those who aim at following those ideals; characteristics, too, which put to shame the coarseness and selfishness and self-assertion, the uglinesses and disproportions, and even vices and vicious tendencies which, under the names of being practical, efficient, and self-respecting, seem to pose as part of the popular ideals of the West. These must be pruned and trained if the truth and the beauty and the goodness of Christ are to be fully exhibited in His Church on earth. They will not be pruned till the Anglo-Saxon learns to see, as the Eastern already sees, that they are blotches and deformities upon a grand ideal and a noble character.

If, then, the Japanese, or those among them who exhibit the best features of the national type, will continue true through all changes to the highest traditions of the race, we think they may contribute in three directions to that through which the Church as a whole may attain to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:

1. Cheerful patience, neither fatalistic nor despairing.
2. A proper estimate of wealth in comparison with other things.
3. The self-subordination of the individual to the interests of the whole body.[1]

The danger of today is that the Japanese under the pressure of race associations with the West will not contribute these qualities to us and to all races, but will surrender, instead, to the very characteristics which they ought to help us to surmount. Likewise, in the appreciation and preservation of beauty, Japan, and indeed all of Asia, is in peril of surrendering to inferior ideals instead of standing fast by racial artistic characteristics and guarding them as a universal trust.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 229.

(d) The essay on the Chinese, by Bishop Hoare, deals with the steadfastness, diligence, practical sense and solidarity of Chinese character and the evidence of the value of these qualities already afforded in the Christian Church in China, and its energy, its martyr-spirit, its will for unity. Commercially and intellectually, the Chinese can hold their own with any race.

No merchant in the East can afford to despise the Chinaman as a man of commerce. His industry, his ability, his reliability, all combine to make him a formidable rival to any European competitor; his power of combination for purposes of trade, and the manner in which he holds to his fellow-countrymen as against the foreigner, enables him, in his own land at any rate, to dictate terms to the European. And in other respects it is, I think, impossible to say that the Chinaman is inferior intellectually to the European. His method of education is different from ours, it has been very different for centuries, and it is the fashion to speak with contempt of his methods; but whether it be as the result of, or in spite of, his methods, the intellectual power of the present generation of Chinese is, without gainsaying, very remarkable. It would be interesting to hear how an advocate for the principle of heredity would explain the fact that a race whose educational training has been for centuries purely classical; whose standard of excellence, by which all candidates for office have been judged, consisted in the power of writing artificial themes in hieroglyphic characters, can at once turn to Western subjects and methods and show themselves the equals of those whose ancestors have long given their minds to such subjects.[1]

Chinese character and race influence are still unsolved problems. Some of the ancient fundamental

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 243.

characteristics of the Japanese were Chinese characteristics also. Indeed, the models of Japan were borrowed from China. It remains to be seen whether China can swing through the transformation which is demanded of her as Japan has done. But if a race is to be credited with its ideals and the moral standards of its best men, the Chinese race as a race has as much to give racially as any race, not excluding the white races; for the Chinese gave Confucianism to Asia, while Christianity was given to the white race.

Indeed, what race but the Chinese answers the description of Professor Flinders Petrie in an article searching for some hope for modern civilization:

> If we were able to mold the future, the reasonable course would be to look around for a race which would best counteract the deficiencies of ourselves, and to favor a mixture in isolation. We need to remedy the unrest and excitability of the present population by producing a more stolid and hard-working people; to counteract the lack of security by a sense of permanence and commercial morality; to hinder the prevalent waste by the development of a frugal and saving habit; to keep our knowledge to its right uses by a peace-loving people who do not glorify fighting; to turn our intellectual frivolity into a love of solid reading and literature. We need a race less sensitive in nerves, though not less perceptive in thought; and, above all, it must be a race which commands the respect and affection of those who have lived among it and know it best. I leave it to the reader to think what cultivated race of the present world would fulfill these conditions.[1]

[1] Petrie, W. M. Flinders, "The Outlook for Civilization," in *Yale Review*, Jan., 1922.

(e) The Mohammedan races with which Bishop Lefroy deals in *Mankind and the Church* are not cognate races at all, but in a sense it is right to group the North Indian and West Asiatic people whose characteristics have found expression in Islam. The fundamental conviction of these races is the Power and Unity of God—

> . . . the conviction that, amidst all the chaos and confusion and disorders of the world which so fearfully obscure it, there is, nevertheless, an ultimate Will, resistless, supreme, and that man is called to be a minister of that Will, to promulgate it, to compel—if necessary by very simple and elementary means indeed—obedience to that Will. This it was which welded the Mohammedan hosts into so invincible an engine of conquest, which inspired them with a spirit of military subordination and discipline, as well as with a contempt of death such as has probably never been surpassed in any system—this it is which, so far as it is still in any true sense operative amongst Mohammedans, gives at once that backbone of character, that firmness of determination and strength of will, and also that uncomplaining patience and submission in the presence of the bitterest misfortune, which characterize and adorn the best adherents of the creed.
>
> That the Unity of God is a necessary ingredient in any such conception of His reality and power as this—made necessary by some of the most fundamental laws of human thought—is obvious. . . . This truth of unity is the one which has been most clearly grasped in thought by Mohammedan theologians themselves, and most earnestly and continuously insisted on. But deeper even than the unity, goes the reality of the existence of God—of His presence and His power—and this I put unhesitatingly as the fundamental truth of Mohammedanism.[1]

[1] *Mankind and the Church*, p. 284 f.

A second contribution of these races is their insistence on the theory, however they have misread it, that it is the knowledge of God which lies at the base of human life and gives strength to human society, that this strength is due to religious truth rather than to any maxims of practical morality or any principles of politics, and that there is a positive objective reality to this truth and to all truth. Mohammedanism is one of the most powerful, sterilizing, and destructive of all religions. Wherever it has gone it has either found a desert or made one.[1] But the races which begot this religion and which have borne it have some great truths and some qualities of life which they need to bring, that they may be rectified and employed by man.

(f) With regard to the Indian races, Mr. Lowes Dickinson has written a very discouraging essay in which, in the matter of art and æsthetic contributions, he groups China and Japan with India, but appears to think that India has less to give than either of them, especially in religion and philosophy. He speaks of the effect of contact with the West on Indian arts and crafts and goes on from this to deeper things, and concludes, "But my own opinion is that India has more to gain and less to lose by contact with the West than any other Eastern country." [2]

[1] See the best apology for it in Bosworth Smith, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism*. See also Ameer Ali, Syed, *The Spirit of Islam*.

[2] Dickinson, G. Lowes, *An Essay on the Civilizations of India, China and Japan*, pp. 38-41.

Christians believe that the West has in Christianity, not a racial possession, but a universal trust for all men far transcending anything the other peoples have to give the West. Whether the other religions have anything to give to Christianity is the point still to be considered. But that the Indian races have something to contribute to the common life of man one can not doubt. Mr. Gokhale names the characteristics which he believes India still retains and which "once placed us in the van of the world's civilization—the depth of our spirituality, our serene outlook on life, our conception of domestic and social duty." Sir Richard Temple described Indian characteristics as he conceived them some years ago:

> For the upper and middle classes, domestic affection, munificence, tenacious adherence to custom, veneration with awe leading to superstition, love of external nature, and inclination for abstract meditation, mental acuteness and subtlety, litigiousness, shrewdness of observation; for the humbler classes, temperance, patience, docility, charitableness to the indigent, endurance, fortitude under disaster, and industry.[1]

But the outstanding characteristic of India is, no doubt, the religiousness of the whole of life. If only the Indian races might bring to the life of all men this ideal of the domination of the whole life by religion, and if that religion were Christ, we should be nearer the longed-for goal of humanity.

[1] Quoted by Harlan P. Beach in *India and Christian Opportunity*, p. 81.

6. The Larger Experience of Christianity

We have been considering the contribution which it may be hoped other races are to make to the fulness of human life and character. The Christian conviction, of course, is that all this is simply raw material awaiting the cleansing and unifying power of Christianity, whose mission it is to purify all that is unholy, to illumine all that is dark, to raise up all that is low, to redeem all life and to bind it to the uses of the Kingdom of Christ. History is full of the work which Christianity has wrought in this long and still continuing process. And the traces of it are written all over our common institutions. The names of the days of the week show the power of Christianity to take up and strip of their old unworthiness the very names of heathen gods and put them to use in Christian service. The Church even calls the most sacred and significant of all its celebrations, the celebration of the central fact of the resurrection of Christ, by the name of a heathen goddess, Eastra. There are those who have deprecated the course of the Christian Church in this respect. The Friends decline to use the once heathen names of the days and months. And Mr. Bertrand Russell reverses the usual criticism of Christian missions as ruthlessly destructive and reproaches the education given in mission schools in China because "it makes the students more conservative in purely Chinese matters than the young men and women who have had a modern education under Chinese auspices. Eu-

ropeans in general," he adds, "are more conservative about China than the modern Chinese are, and they tend to convey their conservatism to their pupils." [1] Apart from these students of mission colleges who were taught to revere their country and to be "conservative in purely Chinese matters," Mr. Russell met only socialists among the young students. "To a man they are socialists, as are most of the best among the Chinese teachers." [2] If Mr. Russell's criticism of the mission schools is accurate, it is greatly to their credit. They are doing just what Christianity has always sought to do, to redeem and conserve. The white race will do its duty toward other races to the extent that it becomes Christian and seeks to help all races to "abhor that which is evil and to cleave to that which is good."

But our final question is not what Christianity, or any race so far as it is Christian, can do to help other races to realize their true character and mission, but how will the contact of Christianity with other races bring out its own latent fulness more clearly and richly. We need to consider the reaction of the contact of Christianity with the non-Christian religions and peoples, not upon Christianity, but upon our apprehension and conceptions of Christianity.

We have much to learn from others. "The West has yet much to learn in the school of Vedanta, so ancient and so meditative," says a well-known Christian writer.[3] And Mr. Slater says: "The West has to learn from

1 Russell, Bertrand, *The Problem of China*, p. 263.
2 *Ibid.*, p. 235.
3 MacNicol, N., *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1908.

the East, and the East from the West. The questions raised by the Vedanta will have to pass into Christianity if the best minds of India are to embrace it; and the Church of the 'farther East' will doubtless contribute something to the thought of Christendom of the science of the soul, and of the omnipenetrativeness and immanence of Deity." [1]

These are sober and true words. They speak of the inadequacy of our thought, not of the inadequacy of Christianity. It is not Christianity that needs help or enlargement. It is humanity. And it is only by their acceptance of Christianity that all races can give their full help. Men do not primarily need a larger intellectual comprehension of the gospel. Indeed, we cannot get it by mere speculation, by comparison of opinions, by new codifications of truth, or new efforts to state the life and will of God and the nature and end of our souls simply in words. We can only get it by more experience, more life, by the actual occupation of humanity by God. It is in the experience of Christianity that help is needed. It is in our living it, in our getting the gospel embodied in our human life. It is thus that the other races are to help us most. And it is the races that are to help us, rather than their religions, save as those religions have come to embody, above their error, the great racial qualities which are to be the contribution of these peoples to the spirit of God for His use as the materials of the Kingdom of

[1] Slater, Thomas E., *The Higher Hinduism in Relation to Christianity*, p. 291.

God, the incarnation of the gospel in the life of mankind.

The non-Christian peoples are far better than the evils of their religions. Even the sanctification of error and wrong in the non-Christian religions has not extirpated from these peoples the likeness of God, which will not be effaced, and that original capacity for Him, for the indwelling of His life, for the execution of His will of righteousness, which is to be their contribution to the universal Church. It is from these races that the new goods of Christianity are to come. To the extent to which the religions of the different races have really supported the strong national qualities of these peoples, which they are to bring to the enlargement of the interpretation of the gospel by the enlargement of our experience of God in Christ, they have made a contribution, but to the extent that they have weakened these they have increased the measure of the encumbrance they have been on the life of the world, or will be if they obstruct the triumph of Christianity.

It is the character of the various races which Christ wants, that He may redeem and use them. And we will cherish the hope, which Dr. Gibson sets forth in his *Mission Problems and Mission Methods in South China,* that through the qualities which the races are to bring into the Church, the Church may pass forward into the gospel which is perfect and complete and needing only to be understood and accepted in its divine fulness. "When to Jewish fervor, Greek passion, Roman restraint, French acuteness, German depth, Eng-

lish breadth, Scottish intensity, and American alertness, are added Indian religious subtlety, with Chinese ethical sagacity—all baptised into the One Spirit—then," says Dr. Gibson, "we may reach at last the fuller theology, worthy of the world-wide hospitalities of the kingdom of heaven, and setting forth more nearly the very thoughts of God." [1]

It is quite possible that hopes such as these are too high and that, as many students hold, the course of human races is now a course of deterioration.[2] From the Christian point of view we should hold: that only the purpose and grace of God can lift races or men; [3] that He provided the institution of race for great and beneficent ends; that the failure of those ends can result only from the disobedience and faithlessness of man; that if we will find and follow His will for men, for races, and for all racial and human relationships, we shall find racial differences not an evil but an immeasurable blessing and the means of a richer and better world, pictured in St. John's vision of the City, full of the glory and honor of the nations.

[1] Gibson, J. Campbell, *Mission Problems and Mission Methods in South China*, p. 286. See also Farquhar, *The Crown of Hinduism*, p. 63 f.

[2] See Adams, Henry, *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma;* also Grant, Madison, *The Passing of the Great Race.*

[3] See Warneck, *The Living Christ and Dying Heathenism*, pp. 147-156.

CHAPTER IV

The Evils and Abuses of Race

1. Racial Antipathy and Fear

The best of human institutions are capable of the worst perversion. It is with race as it is with sex. What God evidently intended for noble and enriching use has been often degraded to baseness and evil. Race prejudice and race strife have taken the place of race respect and race service and have poisoned the life of mankind. "I am convinced myself," says Mr. H. G. Wells, "that there is no more evil thing in this present world than race prejudice, none at all! I write deliberately—it is the worst single thing in life now. It justifies and holds together more baseness, cruelty, and abomination than any other sort of error in the world."

It is impossible to believe that men and races were created or are born with an instinctive prejudice against one another. All over the world the children of different races play together and grow up together with no more manifestation of antagonism than the children of any one race show toward one another. Mr. Stone regards racial antipathy as congenital, a natural contrariety or repugnancy of qualities.[1] But we do not believe that prejudice and antipathy are inherited. They come with education and the pressure of the so-

[1] Stone, *Studies in the American Race Problem*, p. 212.

cial environment. And how did they become a part of the social ideals which control the educational process? Because fear entered in. Professor Park, as it seems to us, overstates the impersonal forces making for race friction, but he is right when he points out that the origin of race friction lies, not in color or in race characteristics, but in fear. Color and other race characteristics, some maintain, are merely markers. The causal factor is fear.

Professor Park says:

> We hate people because we fear them, because our interests, as we understand them, at any rate, run counter to theirs. On the other hand, good-will is founded in the long run upon cooperation. The extension of our so-called altruistic sentiments is made possible only by the organization of our otherwise conflicting interests and by the extension of the machinery of cooperation and social control. . . .
>
> From this point of view we may regard caste, or even slavery, as one of those accommodations through which the race problem found a natural solution. Caste, by relegating the subject race to an inferior status, gives to each race, at any rate, a monopoly of its own tasks. When this status is accepted by the subject people, as in the case where the caste or slavery systems become fully established, racial competition ceases and racial animosity tends to disappear.[1]

The destruction of competition and the acceptance of subserviency, however, Professor Park proceeds to point out, are economically unsound and socially inefficient. And race isolation which, it might be thought,

[1] Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Study of Sociology*, p. 620 f.

would remove the occasion of fear is likewise economically impracticable and is itself "at once a cause and an effect of race prejudice. It is a vicious circle—isolation, prejudice; prejudice, isolation."

Mr. Stone also, although he believes in fundamental, immovable racial characteristics, recognizes that the great source of race friction is fear, and that "the fear and effect of numbers" is one of the determining influences at the foundation of all race relations. When one race is sufficiently in the minority or sufficiently inoffensive in its power of competition, there will be no fear and in consequence no race friction. The friction is inevitable, Mr. Stone believes, whenever one race feels that its interest is imperiled, as it will feel when it is outnumbered and is unable to dictate the status of the other race.[1]

Race antipathy, in a word, springs from fear and produces fear because of the motive of racial self-interest of the race which is supposed to be threatened and endangered unless some other race is held down and is willing to accede to a position of subjugation. Fear is not the only evil of such racial relations. Hate is a yet more lamentable fruitage flowing from racial prejudice and itself producing prejudice. In our contemporary world motivated propaganda has more than once deliberately sought to foment racial hate. The war literature made us familiar with the organized campaign of education in Germany, extending over many years and designed to fill Germany with hate of Great Britain.

[1] Stone, *Studies in the American Race Problem*, p. 57.

No other hate propaganda, perhaps, has wrought such havoc as this, but there have been and are others. What feelings but race distrust and enmity could be produced by Kipling's stab at Russia in "The Bear that Walks Like a Man"? And where could more despicable appeals to race hatred be found than in the New York *American* of July 23, 1916, in such a set of verses as the following "Anti-Japanese Hymn of Hate"?

Look out! California! Beware!
They tell us that Uncle Sam
Would lie down like a lamb,
But he doesn't understand the situation.
He says war talk must cease
While he feeds the dove of peace,
But he doesn't know the peril to the Nation.
But something's going to happen
That will shake things up, perhaps,
If we don't start to clean out the Japs.

Chorus
They lurk upon thy shores, California!
They watch behind thy doors, California!
They're a hundred thousand strong,
And they won't be hiding long;
There's nothing that the dastards would not dare!
They are soldiers to a man, with the schemes of Old Japan.
Look out! California! Beware!

There's a murmur that affirms
We're brothers to the worms,
That serve us in a meek and lowly manner;
But while we watch and wait
They're inside the Golden Gate!

O God! Save the Star-spangled Banner!
With the Army and the Navy
And the White House full of gaps
And our Coast running over with Japs!

They've battleships, they say,
On Magdalena Bay!
Uncle Sam, won't you listen when we warn you?
They meet us with a smile
But they're working all the while,
And they're waiting just to steal our California!
So just keep your eyes on Togo,
With his pocket full of maps,
For we've found out we can't trust the *Japs!*

Many books of our day assume or seek to prove that such hatred of race for race is the actual dominating feeling of the races at the present time and that, whatever humane theory or Christian sentiment may say, race prejudice and conflict are the inexorable and inevitable facts. Mr. Weale construes the present world situation as "The Conflict of Color," and Mr. Stoddard's view is sufficiently set forth in the titles to his books, "The Rising Tide of Color," "The Revolt against Civilization," and "The New World of Islam."

In the modern world [says Mr. Weale] it is in the debatable regions—where what may be called a permanent settlement of frontier lines has not yet been brought about—that there will be a constant swaying to and fro, most probably accompanied by bloody wars, until density of population, and the consequent struggle for existence, either blots out nationality or makes its claims undeniable. . . . The main racial contest—a contest which must be conducted, not only

along frontiers, but in the heart of densely-populated countries as well—can only be between the old antagonists, Europe and Asia. . . . This struggle, however, will approach slowly and methodically, and not rapidly and dramatically as past struggles have done. Every day will bring nearer the inevitable settling day. . . . At the same time that there is this large clash of conflicting ideals looming up—this clash of two necessarily different civilizations, which is to be the mighty problem of the future—another racial struggle of a very different nature has already begun. This question is far more subtle and already considerably complicates the other problem. Briefly, a struggle has begun between the white man and all the other men of the world to decide whether non-white men—that is, yellow men, or brown men, or black men—may or may not invade the white man's countries in order there to gain their livelihood. . . . It is well to understand at once that it is made peculiarly hazardous for the white man, not because he is not able to fight it in the face of all difficulties, not because it is beyond his strength to check it, but because in almost every part of the Asiatic and African worlds he is still playing his old-world rôle of conqueror, and ruling over vast masses of the world's colored population virtually by force. That is the real reason why this struggle must in the end prove highly dangerous. On the one hand, the white man has begun to refuse to allow colored men of any description to enter his countries in large numbers; on the other hand, he continues to rule as conqueror immense areas of the world, the soil of which nourishes autochthonous populations having little or nothing in common with him, and therefore regarding his dominion with a natural and growing aversion.[1]

There are writers who apotheosize Western civilization and then interpret the great confused struggle of

[1] Weale, *The Conflict of Color*, pp. 93, 98 f.

mankind toward a better human order and a truer brotherhood as an indiscriminate assault of the underman; i.e., the inferior man, upon all efficiency and merit and order. They select one set of observations, none too carefully appraised, and set them in inaccurate historic and economic perspective and build them as an inadequate foundation under a predetermined thesis which is erroneous as principle and fallacious as fact. It is quite true that there is a great racial maladjustment in the world and that the so-called "colored" races are awakening and are unwilling longer to accept the place of inferiority and inequality assigned to them in the past by other races.

There is slowly arising [says DuBois] not only a curiously strong brotherhood of Negro blood throughout the world, but the common cause of the darker races against the intolerable assumptions and insults of Europeans has already found expression. Most men in this world are colored. A belief in humanity means a belief in colored men. The future world will, in all reasonable probability, be what colored men make it. In order for this colored world to come into its heritage, must the earth again be drenched in the blood of fighting, snarling human beasts, or will Reason and Good Will prevail?[1]

But the mood of the common people of the world is not a mood of hatred, of violence against prosperity, of assault upon the past. The world is not Bolshevist. The people of all races are friendly spirited, goodwilled, eager only to find a way out of the political and economic entanglements of our time into a new day of

[1] DuBois, W. E. B., *The Negro*, p. 242.

universal peace and brotherhood. It is one of the evils of race that its frictions and antipathies, whatever their cause or ground, can be used to keep men apart, to feed their suspicions and fears, to foster race pride or despair, and to pervert the enriching diversity of humanity into discord and hate.

We must not pass into the very error which we are deprecating; namely, of seeing the evils of the race problem in too narrow a setting or in too near a perspective. It is after all no modern problem of East and West or Black and White. One can see the whole problem with its good and evil in miniature in a land like India. Here are many races, conquered and conquerors, natives and invaders, Dravidians and Aryans, ignorant and intelligent, "inferior" and "superior." Here long ago race and color divisions hardened into caste, and some races accepted the status of subjection and yielded to others a position of privilege close to deity. The evils of fixed race stratification have been demonstrated in India.[1] Is there any reason for thinking that what caste has done for India, the caste principle applied to race will not do for the world?

2. Race Prejudice a Hindrance in Many Ways

Race prejudice has been charged with the responsibility of hindering the development of the science of language.

[1] Moyser, William, "India in the Melting Pot," *The Missionary Review of the World,* Jan., 1923, p. 40.

Not till that word *barbarian* was struck out of the dictionary of mankind and replaced by brother, not till the right of all nations of the world to be classed as members of one genus or kind was recognized [says Max Müller] can we look for the first beginnings of our science. This change was effected by Christianity. . . . *Humanity* is a word which you look for in vain in Plato or Aristotle; the idea of mankind as one family, as the children of one God, is an idea of Christian growth. . . . When people had been taught to look upon all men as brethren, then and then only, did the variety of human speech present itself as a problem that called for solution in the eyes of thoughtful observers; and I, therefore, date the real beginning of the science of language from the first day of Pentecost.[1]

Professor Müller hardly means that the idea of humanity was not found in Greek or Latin thought. It was there, but it was not made effective there, as it was, though still in such imperfect measure, by Christianity.

Race prejudice leads to partisan and embittered misreadings of history. The conflicting accounts of the Reconstruction Era in the South and of the origin and results of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution illustrate the effect of racial sentiments on the interpretation of historical and political movements. The partisans of particular racial views or interests constantly discern in events a deliberate purpose where there was none, but where tendencies operated in which men passively acquiesced with no conscious racial motive. DuBois himself furnishes an illustration of this tend-

[1] Müller, *Lectures on the Science of Language,* 1st Series, Lecture IV, "The Classificatory Stage."

ency to read racial prejudice into history when the developments are not really an intentional race discrimination: "Negroes in Africa, the West Indies, and America were to be forced to work by land monopoly, taxation, and little or no education. In this way a docile industrial class working for low wages, and not intelligent enough to unite in labor unions, was to be developed." [1] The movement he is describing was too big and human for deliberate racial manipulation. It was an unordered movement of social masses.

One of the worst effects of interracial relations has been the economic exploitation and the moral abuse of the weaker races. The races of the South Seas and of Africa have been among the chief sufferers. The picture in Herman Melville's *Typee* of the scene on his ship in the harbor of Nukuheva in the Marquesas Islands in 1842 is too true an account of much of the early contact of the white race with the primitive peoples:

> Our ship was now wholly given up to every species of riot and debauchery. The grossest licentiousness and the most shameful inebriety prevailed, with occasional and but short-lived interruptions, through the whole period of her stay. Alas for the poor savages when exposed to the influence of these polluting examples. Unsophisticated and confiding, they are easily led into every vice, and humanity weeps over the ruin thus remorselessly inflicted upon them by their European civilizers. Thrice happy are they who, inhabiting some yet undiscovered island in the midst of the ocean, have never been brought into contact with the white man.

[1] DuBois, *The Negro*, p. 237.

In *American Diplomacy in the Orient,* the Hon. John W. Foster, Secretary of State under President Harrison, tells of the struggle of the Hawaiian Islands against liquor and vice. Honolulu had been a brothel for visiting ships until under missionary influence the Hawaiians sought to abolish licentiousness and intemperance. "This strictness," says Mr. Foster, "interfered not only with the depraved habits of the vicious but with the profits of many traders." For a time an armed vessel of the American Navy overrode the Hawaiian authorities and insisted that the vessel should enjoy the ancient privilege of unlimited immorality.[1] Contact with the white race introduced among many of these people destructive diseases never known before. It is not too much to say that the early contacts of the white races with the other races were generally pitched on a selfish and immoral level.[2]

3. Two Comforting Considerations

Two thoughts serve to ameliorate a little the shame which the white races should feel at the history of their relations with the backward peoples. One is that the moral conscience of the world has advanced and that from base beginnings the races have moved forward to a more honorable and helpful intercourse. Dr. James Stewart says that the African's "connection with the

[1] Foster, *American Diplomacy in the Orient,* pp. 115-118.

[2] Hobson, J. A., "Opening of Markets and Countries," in *Universal Races Congress,* 1911, pp. 227, 230. See also article by Lord Meston, "India at the Crossways," in *The East and the West,* Jan., 1923, p. 70; Page, Jesse, *The Black Bishop,* p. 320.

higher races hitherto has been to him a doubtful benefit," but, writing in 1902, he goes on:

When far on in the next century some African comes to write the history of his continent and his race, he will probably write thus: that up to a certain point or date "our contact with the higher civilized races of Europe and America invariably resulted in our further deterioration. We were shipped in multitudes across the seas to grow sugar, cotton, and tobacco. That seemed to be all we were good for, at least all that we were reckoned to be good for. When that business came to an end, other trades sprang up, the chief articles being spirits, guns and gunpowder, which we used to destroy ourselves and to destroy one another. About the end of the nineteenth century, or the beginning of the twentieth, a change for the better began to appear. It is true, the whole of the continent was partitioned among the civilized peoples of Europe, and at first we did not reap much benefit thereby. Some regions were rendered more miserable than before. But gradually, through the substitution of a humaner and wiser rule, and by the progress of education, and most of all through the introduction of Christianity, we have now reached a happier and better condition of life."[1]

The second comforting fact is that on the whole, evil though the past has been, it has yielded already a net result of good. Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones takes this view in the report on *Education in Africa* presented by the Commission, of which he was chairman, which visited Africa in 1920-21 and on which both white and black men served. In discussing "European and American Influences" he writes:

[1] Stewart, James, *Dawn in the Dark Continent*, p. 365 f.

There have been various interpretations of the contributions made by the white races to Africa. Some have thought that the influences of Europeans and Americans have been more for evil than for good. Some have thought it would have been better to leave the African in his natural condition. Few have realized the importance of the movements that have been started and the changes that have been wrought. It must be stated that many mistakes have been made and many injustices have been perpetrated. In some sections the Africans have suffered tragically at the hands of selfish white exploiters. Evil influences originated by white people still persist in too many parts of Africa. It is, however, the emphatic conviction of the Education Commission that the gains that have come to Africa through the white man are far greater than the losses.[1]

There are some who would dispute this view and still others who would hold that Africa has suffered as much at the hands of Africans as of Europeans.[2]

4. The Abuse of Weaker Races

Even if we accept these two mollifying judgments, it is indisputable that strong races have imposed on weaker races two evils whose vicious character cannot be overstated.

One of these was the traffic in liquor and opium. This traffic in liquor will be one of the terrible counts in the indictment which posterity will draw against Europe and America in their dealings with Africa. We have

[1] Jones, Thomas Jesse, *Education in Africa*, pp. 7, 8.

[2] For a fair and able study of Bantu Africa and the character of Bantu and European rule, see Willoughby, *Race Problems in the New Africa.*

slowly rooted out the atrocious traffic in slaves only to plant in its place the equally abominable trade in strong drink. Some would say, more abominable. "It is my sincere belief," declared Sir Richard Burton, "that if the slave trade were revived with all its horrors, and Africa could get rid of the white man with the gunpowder and rum which he has introduced, Africa would be the gainer by the exchange." Little by little, beginning with the Berlin Conference in 1884, the struggle against the liquor traffic in Africa made headway in spite of political and commercial obstruction, and now there are wide zones of prohibition or heavy tariff duties which protect, though as yet only in part, the African races from the physical and moral degradation of drink.

The opium trade in Asia is the counterpart of the liquor trade in Africa and the South Seas. Mr. Foster quotes a letter from Mr. W. N. Pethick, an American long resident in China, which had been transmitted to the State Department by Dr. Angell, then American Minister at Peking, in which Mr. Pethick stated that at that time the single article of opium imported equaled in value all other goods brought into China, and was greater than all the tea or all the silk (the two chief articles of export) sent out of the country—which showed that the black stream of pollution which had so long flowed out of India into China had been increasing in volume and spreading its baneful influence wider and wider. [1]

[1] Foster, John Watson, *American Diplomacy in the Orient*, p. 296.

And Mr. Foster, one of the most careful and temperate of men, added:

> There is much to be said in commendation of the British government in its relations with the Orient, but its connection with the opium traffic of China has left a dark and ineffaceable stain upon its record. In this matter the greed of the East India Company and its successor, the Government of India, triumphed over the moral sentiment of the nation, which has done so much for the amelioration of the condition of mankind.[1]

China and Japan have fought a long battle against the opium trade and have in great measure prevailed, although even now corrupt Chinese and Western or Indian allies seek to continue the destructive traffic, and Japan, still sedulously excluding the drug from its own people, cooperates with wholesale exporters of morphine in Scotland and the United States to degrade China with this new habit in place of the old. Does not the same principle of humanity which favors the freest interchange in wholesome trade also condemn all commerce in articles which destroy human efficiency between races of equal strength, and still more between the races which have power to injure others and the races which do not have power to resist?[2]

The second great evil imposed on weaker races by the

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 299.

[2] Hearings before 67th Congress on "Limiting Production of Habit Forming Drugs." Speech by S. G. Porter, Feb. 26, 1923, House of Representatives. Peking and Tientsin *Times*, Sept. 6, 1920. New York *Times*, editorial, "The Opium Traffic," Feb. 15, 1923. *Far Eastern Fortnightly*, Jan. 17 and 31, 1921.

strong has been slavery. It is true that slavery has not always been interracial. Among the Greeks and Romans the institution had been wholly independent of race distinction. Plato held that nature had intended some to bear rule and others to serve. The Roman law held the slave, not as an alien but as a man, to be property like any other chattel.[1] "The slaves at Athens were of the same blood with their masters, at least not separated from them by such apparent differences of race as separate the African or the Malaysian from the European." [2] In Egypt races and people of any color were enslaved. The whole Hebrew nation in Egypt bore the slave status. In the early days in America there were more white slaves than black:

> In less than a score of years after their first introduction, white servants were exported to the colonies as a species of merchandise and were dealt with as any other article of commodity. Moreover, such was the scarcity of labor and the pecuniary inducements held out that many poor people sold themselves in order to reach these shores. A census taken in 1625 shows that there were, at that date, 464 white servants and 22 Negro slaves in the Virginia colony. Forty years later there were more than six thousand white indentured servants in the same section.[3]

But the great development of the institution of human slavery rested on race discrimination. Among the ancients, as nations spread by military conquest, the

1 Uhlhorn, Gerhard, *Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, pp. 131-141.
2 Storrs, R. S., *Divine Origin of Christianity*, pp. 154-164.
3 Thomas, William H., *The American Negro*, p. 5.

vanquished passed under the yoke of bondage. And in the modern world, outside of a few lands where there is intraracial agricultural serfdom or industrial indenture, slavery has become a matter of race relationship.

No one can be found any longer to apologize for the horrors of the African slave traffic. And it would be hard to say which races are guilty of the grosser brutality, the Arabs or the Europeans. The actual raiding of the interior villages has been the work of the Moslem Arabs. But the activity of the white races has been no less evil, and it is not improbable that on the west slavery in the past and forced labor in the present have cost Africa many more lives than the Arabs carried north or northeast.[1]

The supreme experience of men in the matter of the enslavement of one race by another was given to us in America. This is a true statement. It was given to us. Southern people who lived at the time of the Civil War had not enslaved the Negro. The Negro slaves in the South at the time of the Civil War had not been raped from Africa. Both whites and blacks had come into their relationship by inheritance. While almost all the blacks were slaves, by no means all of the whites were slave owners. "The total white population of the fifteen slaveholding states in 1860 was 8,099,760, and the number of slaveholders was 383,637; of whom 277,000 owned less than ten slaves each; 10,751 owned fifty or more; 1,733 owned one hundred or more; 312 owned over 200; fourteen owned 500; while there were prac-

1 See DuBois, *The Negro*, pp. 155-159.

tically 75,000 who owned only one each."[1] Originally, moreover, there was a stronger anti-slavery feeling in the South than in the North.[2] The invention of the cotton gin, the consequent profitableness of Negro labor, the rapid growth of the slave population (numbering 700,000 in 1790 and 1,191,362 in 1810, and 2,009,043 in 1830 and 3,204,313 in 1850), the lack of education among the masses of the Southern whites, the geographical isolation of the States, the increasing struggle between diverse political principles, the commercial greed and rivalry of each section, and racial discrimination are some of the reasons given for the disappearance of the early abolition sentiment and the growth, instead, of the doctrine of the sanctity of slavery as a divine institution.

Some hold that slavery rests on race antipathy, others that race antipathy springs from slavery. Undoubtedly each reacts on the other, although there are those who argue that slavery accepted by the slaves is the one sure method of escaping race friction.[3] But is not the idea of a permanent acceptance by any race of its own enslavement illusory? Has there ever been or could there ever be such an atrophy of the sense of manhood and freedom? Even when long stifled, has not the spirit of revolt been only asleep and not dead? Do not those who think that the Negro was satisfied with the status of slavery ignore the mass of evidence which disproves

[1] Moore, John M., *The South Today*, p. 31.
[2] Thomas, *The American Negro*, p. 28.
[3] Stone, *Studies in the American Race Problem*, p. 220.

their idea? Is it not true that if the South had won the Civil War and set up an independent Confederacy on the basis of States Rights and Slavery, it would have given them both up within fifty years?

The institution of slavery in the South bore two aspects. "One hears, on the one hand," says DuBois, "of the staid and gentle patriarchy, the wide and sleepy plantations with lord and retainers, ease and happiness; on the other hand, one hears of barbarous cruelty and unbridled power and wide oppression of men. Which is the true picture? The answer is simple: both are true." [1] Nevertheless, the institution was a wrong and evil institution, and the theft of the Negro from Africa was a crime of which Africa still bears the deep scar and for which both the black and the white race in America have suffered and have to suffer more. Economically and morally slavery was a curse to the South, but it has brought its blessings both to the white and black, to the black most of all. Compare the Negro population of the United States today with the Negro races in Africa. But also it has brought the blessing of a race testing and of the possibility of a greater race sympathy and service to the white race.

Out of so great an evil as the enslavement of the black by the white race has been, there ought to be won some great good both to the Negro and to the whole human race.

[1] DuBois, *The Negro*, p. 190.

5. Our Treatment of Indians, Chinese, Italians, and Others

Two other instances of race injustice on the part of the white race in America were our treatment of the Indians and the method of our dealing with the problem of Chinese immigration. In the matter of the Indians, Mrs. Helen Hunt Jackson's *A Century of Dishonor* is the classic indictment of our national policy, "free from exaggeration and over vehemence," as Colonel Higginson said, and "thoroughly justified with facts and citations."

And the late Bishop Whipple in repeated speeches and published statements set forth the wrongs which the Indians suffered at our hands. He charged that "in all our relations with the Indians we have persistently carried out the idea that they were a sovereign people." Yet, "they did not possess a single element of sovereignty" and we never allowed them to exercise any except the matter of treaty making, and in this we habitually deceived them and habitually broke the treaties we made with them. We destroyed their tribal government and allowed no replacement of it.

> The only being in America who has no law to punish the guilty or protect the innocent is the treaty Indian. . . . The only law administered by ourselves was to pay a premium for crime. . . . The Government . . . has really given the weight of influence on the side of heathen life. The sale of fire water has been almost unblushing. . . . The system of trade was ruinous to honest traders and pernicious to the

Indian. . . . Every influence which could add to the degradation of this hapless race seems to be its inheritance. . . . The history of our dealings with the Indian has been marked by gross acts of injustice and robbery.[1]

A better day came for the Indians at last, but only after a long story of iniquitous race oppression and injustice perpetrated by a strong and intelligent race on a race that was ignorant and weak. It was not the wrong of man against man only. It was the wrong of race against race. John Quincy Adams called it in its early beginnings a "mass of putrefaction." The white race would not have thought of dealing with such faithlessness and cruelty with a race capable of resisting it.

Our dealings with the Chinese made an equally shameful though a much shorter story. It is wonderful that the Chinese should be able to cherish such kindly feelings as they do today toward America, and in a lesser measure toward Europe, when we recall what the Chinese race has had to endure.

The history of race prejudice in America has not been confined to our relations with Negroes, Indians, and Chinese. The Italians had for years many of the same difficulties experienced by the Chinese, and for some of the same reasons. The worst outbreak of race animosity against them was in the Louisiana riots in 1894-95 which led to a long negotiation with Italy over the failure of the State of Louisiana to punish the murderers and the inability of the national government to

[1] Whipple, Henry Benjamin, *Lights and Shadows of a Long Episcopate*, pp. 124, 125, 140. See also pp. 510-562.

deal with crimes which could not be denied, but which fell only under state jurisdiction. It was then that President McKinley first raised the question as to whether the national government ought not to be equipped with all the power necessary to fulfil national obligations. Surely it could not be right, he argued, to contract national or racial obligations and then to set up the internal political policies of one party to the contract as an excuse for their violation. We would not tolerate such an excuse from the other race. How could we set it up for ourselves? Ought not races to act under codes of equal obligation in treaty fulfilment?

There has been anti-British feeling in the nation ever since colonial times. We have already referred to the part which the Scotch-Irish animosity to the English played in the Revolutionary War. The large number of Irish who have come to America since, their sense of grievance against England, the national sympathy of America with people under oppression, whether real or apparent, and the manipulation of racial antipathies for political or religious ends have helped to intensify the early sentiment of anti-English prejudice. The course of Great Britain in the Civil War[1] and a great deal of the intercourse of the English and the American people for three generations aggravated this prejudice. Strong forces are at work today both to perpetuate and to remove it.

The problem of race relations with the Jews will present itself later, and it is a European as much as an

[1] See *The Education of Henry Adams*, pp. 110-179.

American question. It must suffice here to remind ourselves that the race clashes which we have known in America have been far exceeded in all the other continents, except perhaps South America, and that there, while intermarriage has mingled all the races, as will appear, there remains almost as sharp a racial cleavage between the old Spaniard and the Indian as between white and black in the United States.

The history of Europe is a story of interracial struggle. It is true that there are no pure races there and that the struggle has been between races all of them inextricably mixed, but there has been identity enough in the amalgams to make their conflict in reality a conflict of race cultures and ambitions, languages and religions.

Africa has been the scene of a prolonged and intricate racial wrestle. Many native races have been exterminated and some, like the Bushmen, are nearly gone.[1] Tribal wars, the slave trade, and the great tidal wave of the Bantu conquests have wiped out whole peoples and altered the racial map of the continent.

In Asia the race struggle has been as old as history and as new as today—between the peoples whose story is recorded in the Old Testament, the shadowy tribes who move about in the mists of early legend, the composite elements now making up each Asiatic nation; between Aryan, Dravidian, Scythian, Iranian, Maratha, Brahman, Rajput, Mongol, in India; between Chinese, Mongol, and Tartar, in China; Japanese and Korean;

[1] Stewart, *Dawn in the Dark Continent*, p. 82.

Malay, Chinese, Indian, Siamese, and Eurasian in the Malay Peninsula. It is all one long tale of race discord, and no race has been free from it, neither Russian nor British nor any other.[1]

6. *The Armenians*

The whole story and the world's abiding problem may be summarized in one concrete illustration, the story of the Armenians and Assyrians, their expulsion from their homes in Turkey and Persia, and their threatened racial destruction before the eyes of mankind. The Armenians are one of the oldest Christian races, and their Gregorian Church is one of the oldest Christian churches. They lived in their Anatolian homes centuries before the Turks appeared on the pages of history. Now they have been driven from Turkey, their own land, and, save for the territory allowed them under Russian Soviet authority around their ancient seat in trans-Caucasia, the race is homeless. No doubt some of the Armenian revolutionaries committed crimes in the name of freedom. No doubt there have been dishonest Armenian people. No doubt the nation's service both through sympathy and national interest and the compulsion of relationship with Russia and France was thrown with the Allies in the World War. The case against the Armenians from the point of view of the Turks may be made never so black. Neverthe-

1 Vambery, Arminius, *Western Culture in Eastern Lands*, pp. 60, 79; Nundy, Alfred, *Indian Unrest*, pp. 11-16; Nundy, *Political Problems*, Chaps. III, VI, X.

less, these facts are sure: the only right of the Turk to rule over the Armenians and to dispossess him of his country was the right of military force; the Western nations were bound by treaty, by official promises, and by every consideration of justice to provide for the Armenian race security, freedom, and a national home; and now, expelled from their own country, they sit, a broken race, on the doorstep of the world.[1] Obviously, the race problem is too great for man, for the solution of expulsion from Turkey of Armenian and Greek also, and of the Turk from Greece, is no solution of the race problem.[2] Greek and Armenian blood is running thick in Turkish veins. Can that be expelled? Turkey's own prosperity has received as heavy a blow as she has given the race she has wronged.

Of forty-eight Grand Viziers of note during the four centuries [says Professor Porter of Beirut] only twelve were of Turkish ancestry, the others were Armenian or Greek by descent. The Turks have had to depend on these races for their business and finance, and in destroying them they are bringing upon themselves financial ruin. The Turks are to be pitied. Across the centuries they have suffered as well as inflicted wrong, and now in the effort at self-preservation and assertion they are exchanging for exploitation by the Western races what might have been secured under a right solution of racial problems; namely, a happy cooperation of races in

[1] The New York *Times*, Jan. 11, 1923.

[2] Bryce, *The Treatment of the Armenians*, Blue Book No. 31, 1916; *Reconstruction in Turkey*, edited by William H. Hall; "Report of International Commission to Inquire into the Cause and Conduct of the Balkan Wars"; Crabites, *Armenia and the Armenians*; Dowling, *The Armenian Church*; Speer, *Missions and Modern History*, Vol. II, Chap. IX and authorities cited there.

a transformed Turkish Empire. Only it could not have been transformed and remained Moslem.[1]

The Near East tragedy is also one evidence of the inevitable association of race antipathy or misunderstanding and war. There is too much warrant in history for the view which is common among students of race relationships that these relationships must be construed in terms of conflict, economic and social always, and if necessary, military. It is impossible to draw a clear line between race and nationality, and much may be charged to race which is really due to a false development of the spirit of nationalism. The World War was not a race war at all. Kindred races were on opposite sides, and races between which the deepest antipathies are supposed to exist were on the same side. In the Civil War also, though the status of the Negro race was one of the issues, the war was between two sections of what was then and is still the most homogeneous race in the world. Nevertheless, race prejudices are the cause, or are intertwined with the causes, of war. The spirit of brotherhood and the ideal of humanity, if they were dominant over race alienation, would find a way without war to settle disagreements which can be settled by peaceable means, and would prevent the development of any other kind of disagreement. If we can solve the problem of race, we shall prevent war. It is conceivable that wrongs within a race might still lead to revolution, but it is not probable

[1] Toynbee, *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey; Reconstruction in Turkey;* Koelle, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism.*

that in a world of interracial good-will and justice there would be any root of war left inside any race.

The price which the world has paid and pays today for race misunderstanding and suspicion and conflict and maladjustment, if the race problem be soluble, proves either the incompetence or the iniquity or the insanity of mankind.

7. *Intolerance and Lynching*

There are other forms of racial struggle which fall short of war but which are full of political peril and fruitful of social evil. There may be good purpose in some of these efforts, and there may be real evils with which they endeavor to deal, but such efforts may nevertheless be cast in forms of secrecy and violence which make open and righteous settlements impossible. The Ku Klux Klan in its present revival is an illustration.

Such intolerance is the destruction of liberty in the name of liberty. There ought to be religious and racial freedom. If the Roman Catholic Church were to attempt ecclesiastical domination, as it established it in other times and other lands, it would be necessary to resist and defeat it. If Jew or Negro were to attempt, in the case of the Jew financial domination, or in the case of the Negro any usurpation of rights which do not politically or socially belong to him, the rest of society would be justified in taking the measures appropriate for its protection. But race and religious injustice are not the right ways to prevent the supposed

threat of such injustice. They only invite and instigate it.

Still another evil expression of racial strife is our atrocious institution of lynching. It is not wholly an interrace crime. In 1922 there were 57 lynchings in the United States of which 51 were Negroes and 6 white. They occurred in ten states, all southern—18 in Texas, 11 in Georgia, 9 in Mississippi, and so forth. Between 1885 and 1922 the number of persons lynched, always by mobs, was 4,154.

Of the total number lynched during this period, 1,034 were white and 3,120 were Negro victims. Doubtless many more of whom no record was made were similarly murdered. In 1919 there were 83 persons lynched; in 1920 there were 61; in 1921, 64; and in 1922 there were at least 57 lynched.

Some of those lynched by mobs were charged with crime; many of them were charged with misdemeanors only; some only with words or acts which are nowhere at any time punishable by law. All were slain without trial where they might have faced their accusers, have had witnesses and have had the evidence considered by a lawful judge or jury. The frenzied mob was judge, jury, and executioner.

In many cases persons not sought by the mobs have been lynched by mistake, so wild and savage has been the procedure. Some of the victims suffered indescribable torture, such as saturation of parts of the body with kerosene or gasoline so that they could be burned piecemeal, branding with hot irons, or the gouging out of eyes and ears with red-hot rods.

The states free from this blot are few in number. There are only four—Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont—where such an atrocity has not been recorded for any community in the Commonwealth.

Rape is usually alleged as the principal cause of lynchings. Certainly such a crime could not be attributed to the 83 women victims! As a matter of fact nearly four fifths of all the lynchings in thirty-seven years have been for alleged crimes other than rape or for alleged acts that are not crimes or misdemeanors under any law, common or statute.

Out of 4,097 victims only 829—60 white and 769 Negroes—were lynched on the charge of rape or attempted rape. This is only 20.2 per cent of the total. And it should be remembered that these men had been accused, not convicted, of the crime.

More than one third of the victims lynched since 1889 were accused of homicide or felonious assault. About one twelfth were accused of crime against property; some were alleged to have "insulted" white persons, and more than 145 were not recorded as accused of any crime whatsoever.

"Mob law" undermines the very foundations of government, law and order.[1]

The poison of race passions creeps back into the hating race. If white people can do wrong to Negroes, why should they not do wrong also to their own race? Mob violence against black men is a sure school for contempt of law among the whites. All race injustice has its Nemesis.

8. Racial Arrogance

The evils that lie back of all others are the fundamental evils of race assumption and privilege, the idea

[1] Federal Council *Bulletin*, Feb.-March, 1923; "The Challenge of Lynching to the Church," published by the Commission on the Church and Race Relations of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; New York *Times*, Jan. 1, 1923.

of a race that it has a right of prescriptive precedence over other races, a false pride in the sense of superior race culture, the conception of aristocratic race values entitling one race to dominate other races, the spirit of race suspicion and distrust, the application to race relations of the principle of gain and exploitation rather than of use and trusteeship and brotherhood. These evils are not limited to any one race. Some of them characterized even the professed communism of the Russian Soviet. Some of them are found in the most enlightened intelligence of India. Under the cry of "Bande Mataram," "Hail Motherland," the doctrine of race superiority has been preached in India as eloquently as in the West. The Ethiopian movement in South Africa has made use of the same shibboleths against the whites with which we have dealt in America in our discussion of the subject of Chinese and Japanese immigration. To get rid of the evils of race friction and conflict we must go behind them to the fountains and establish in men's minds right thoughts about race relations and right feelings toward all their fellow men, irrespective of their color or race.

Abraham Lincoln is proof that this can be done, that the problem of race is not too great for the mind and spirit of men who seek to know and obey the laws of God. "In all my interviews with Mr. Lincoln," said Frederick Douglass, "I was impressed with his entire freedom from popular prejudice against the colored race. He was the first great man that I talked with in the United States freely, who in no single instance

reminded me of the difference between himself and myself, of the difference of color, and I thought this all the more remarkable because he came from a state where there were black laws." [1] Lincoln never supposed that he had solved the race problem. He knew that slavery was only one aspect of it and that the abolition of slavery created more problems than it solved, and he felt the deepest anxiety over the innumerable aspects of the great question which remained. Before the war he had not been ready for Negro franchise. In 1853 in a campaign letter he wrote: "I go for all sharing the privilege of government who assist in bearing its burdens. Consequently, I go for admitting all whites to the right of suffrage who pay taxes or bear arms, by no means excluding females." In 1864 he said, "Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the support of capital and deserves much the higher consideration." Utterances like these led on to his statement in his last public declaration that he was in favor of extending the elective franchise to colored men.[2] How he would have changed the conditions of its extension we do not know. He believed in equality. In 1855 he said, "Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation we began by declaring that *all men are created equal*. We now practically read it *all men are created equal except Negroes.*" Later we enlarged the exception so as to exclude all but

[1] *Reminiscences of Lincoln*, p. 193. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 139 f.

the Nordic race! At the same time he saw the coming issues, and General Butler tells of a conversation in which Lincoln indicated his anxiety for some solution.[1] And yet Lincoln had found, and he himself was the solution of the race problem, the hope and the assurance of the escape of men from the evils of race friction and injustice. By the facts of sympathy and brotherhood and truth he evaded or denied none of the facts of race difference or human inequality; he proposed no doctrinaire scheme of equalitarianism or amalgamation; nor did he on the other hand erect any walls of forbidden advance against any human beings, nor set up the generalized abstraction of race character against individual capacity or virtue. With him, as with Burns, man was man. There are realities in all human intercourse—affinities, working arrangements for human happiness and well-being and progress. We must come soon to consider these. But the final thought with which this chapter leaves us is the thought of man as man, brother and friend to every other man, and transcending in this good-will and helpfulness all the gulfs and chasms of race.

Then let us pray that come it may,
As come it will for a' that,
That sense and worth, o'er a' the earth,
May bear the gree, and a' that.
For a' that, and a' that,
It's coming yet for a' that,
When man to man, the warld o'er,
Shall brothers be for a' that.

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 151 ff.

CHAPTER V

Aspects and Relations of Race

The race question, as has appeared again and again, is a question not of the relation of race to race only, but also of the relation of race to color, climate, nationality, religion, language, communications, and social and moral ideals. We shall be better prepared to consider the various proposed solutions of the race problem if we first examine some of these conditioning elements.

1. Race and Color

The criterion of race now most commonly used is color. Head measurements and indices of one kind and another have proved too confusing and erratic. Color has seemed to be a simple and more accurate differential. And many of the modern race studies accordingly have resolved the race issue into a color issue. Some of these, as we have seen, have gone so far as to talk of "white" and "black" blood, and less sophisticated peoples have conceived God as of their favorite racial complexion.

Two separate questions emerge: What is the relation of color to race? What is the relation of color to race prejudice?

(1) Modern physiology is assured that color in general is a matter not of race plasm or fixed heredity but

of climatic environment.[1] Von Luschan objects to racial classification on the basis of color.

> We now know [he says] that color of skin and hair is only the effect of environment, and that we are fair only because our ancestors lived for thousands, or probably tens of thousands, of years in sunless and foggy countries. Fairness is nothing else but lack of pigment, and our ancestors lost part of their pigment because they did not need it. . . .
>
> It is also said of the primitive races that they are not as cleanly as we are. Those who say this, however, forget the dirt of Eastern Europe, and are ignorant that most primitive men bathe every day, and that the Bantu and many other Africans clean their teeth after every meal for more than half an hour with their *msuaki*, while on the contrary, millions of Europeans never use a tooth brush.[2]

Color as color is purely a matter of the skin, not a matter of racial character, and even as a differentiating mark it is very inaccurate and misleading.[3] There are many Negroes with "white" blood in their veins, who are fixed by our present idea within the Negro race, who are nevertheless much fairer than many Caucasians. Unless it was known by some other evidence that they were not pure white people, their color would not mark their race. The futility of color as a definitive race sign, save in the crudest way, is undeniable.[4]

[1] Dixon, *The Racial History of Man*, pp. 478-480.

[2] Von Luschan, Felix, *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, p. 14. Perhaps von Luschan forgets the swarthy Eskimos.

[3] Lyde, Lionel W., paper on "Climatic Control of Skin Color," in *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, p. 104.

[4] Finot, *Race Prejudice*, p. 104.

(2) Is color, then, the ground of race aversion or, as is sometimes alleged, the cause of race antipathy? There does not appear to have been any color prejudice among the ancients. No emphasis appears to have been laid on physical differences. Today, however, the physical differences and especially color are set forth as the chief basis of racial alienation.

The chief obstacles to the assimilation of the Negro and the Oriental [says Professor Park] are not mental, but physical traits. It is not because the Negro and the Japanese are so differently constituted that they do not assimilate. If they were given an opportunity, the Japanese are quite as capable as the Italians, the Armenians, or the Slavs of acquiring our culture and sharing our national ideals. The trouble is not with the Japanese mind, but with the Japanese skin. The Jap is not the right color. . . .

This not only determines to a very large extent the attitude of the white world toward the yellow man, but it determines the attitude of the yellow man toward the white. It puts between the races the invisible but very real gulf of self-consciousness.[1]

Mr. Weale also finds in color the cause of race prejudice:

There is one thing which can never be altered and that is color. For here is the real root of the racial difficulty throughout the world. There exists a widespread racial antipathy founded on color—an animal-like instinct, if you will, but an instinct which must remain in existence until the world becomes Utopia. It is this instinct which seems to forbid really frank intercourse and equal treatment.[2]

[1] Park and Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*, p. 760.

[2] Weale, *The Conflict of Color*, p. 110.

There is a curious support given to this view by the inner social prejudices of the race whose leaders most strenuously resent the idea of color discrimination. A Negro writes of them:

> Social prejudices are not confined to color or races; they pervade all segments of society and enter into all the ramifications of human life. Nowhere are they more intense and unreasonable than among the Negroes themselves, who have established within their own ranks innumerable social distinctions, which, strange to say, are based solely on color. For example, in many sections, light-hued Negroes associate together, and hold themselves as much aloof from contact with the blacks as do the most exclusive whites. In fact, there exists among these people a graduated series of color distinctions, with the blackest constituting the base, and the fairest the apex, of the social column. But, though there is neither logic nor sense in discriminations based on variations of racial color, nevertheless these social antipathies of the freedmen are as pronounced in character and as relentless in effect as those which their most inveterate white enemies have shown.[1]

But this same writer proceeds to deny the validity of the view that color is the cause of antipathy.[2] The fact probably is that color, as the most conspicuous of all racial characteristics, is the easiest and most natural thing to suggest, and to be made the object of the expression of, race feeling. But also because it is a matter of the skin and not of the character of a man or of a race, it is entirely feasible for races and individuals to be free from color consciousness. The French

[1] Thomas, William H., *The American Negro*, p. 292.
[2] *Ibid.*, 294 ff.

are largely free from it [1] and have protested against its introduction from America. And even among us the manifestations of color antipathy are peculiar. White and Negro children play together and white people call colored nurses "Mammie" all their days. "Sam was my Negro companion, philosopher, and friend," says Walter Page of his boyhood crony. There was no color antipathy there. Some white people in Alabama have protested against the appointment by the Government of any but white officers and physicians to the new Veteran's Bureau Hospital in Tuskegee, and yet all the patients for whom these white doctors would have to care are Negroes.[2] There is no color antipathy there. Economic considerations triumphed completely over racial prejudice. The Negroes have protested against these white appointments on both racial and economic grounds and yet object to the existence of a color line! In truth, color is only a rough external sign of great value to distinguish races when for any geographical or historical reason they need to be distinguished, but external and irrelevant when such reasons for distinguishment disappear—and this is true whether the color be black or yellow or white.

There are men to whom color is as though it were not.

Judging from my personal acquaintance with Mr. Cleveland [said Booker Washington] I do not believe that he is conscious of possessing any color prejudice. He is too great

1 Arthur Young's *Travels in France.*
2 The New York *Times,* June 22, 1923.

for that. In my contact with people I find that, as a rule, it is only the little, narrow people who live for themselves, who never read good books, who do not travel, who never open up their souls in a way to permit them to come in contact with other souls—with the great outside world. No man whose vision is bounded by color can come into contact with what is highest and best in the world.[1]

There are people to whom people of another color are naturally repugnant. There have been cases of white women temporarily deranged by sudden transplanting to life among a colored race. But the colored races have often also a similar repugnance to the white. For what is color? The Rev. J. B. Cochran of Hwai Yuen, China, reported hearing a Chinese preacher discoursing on the races of mankind. "There are five great races," said he. "There are the black colored race, and the white colored race, and the brown colored race, and the red colored race, and lastly there are we Chinese, the skin colored race." Each race is "skin colored" in its own eyes. All the other races are tinted.

2. Race and Climate

It seems clear that it is climate operating through long centuries of time which accounts for color—if not for its origin, at least, in conjunction with heredity, for its survival and continuance. For how much also does it account in the formation of race character? "Climate, food, and soil," says Buckle, ". . . have

[1] Washington, Booker T., *Up from Slavery*, p. 228.

originated the most important consequences in regard to the general organization of society, and from them have followed many of the large and conspicuous differences between nations which are often ascribed to some fundamental differences in the various races into which mankind is divided." [1]

Mr. Weale goes further. In his view, climate is the supreme factor, more powerful than color. At the back of Asia's alleged hate of the white man,

> . . . there is little question of color, no matter what there might be on the European side.
>
> The white man is not hateful because he is white, but because he is strong, confident, and overbearing. . . . The climate of the East is responsible for the peculiar philosophy and social atmosphere of the East—both of which are totally different from the philosophy and social atmosphere of the West, and neither of which can be really changed in their fundamentals, no matter what efforts are put forth. The changes will be in material, practical things—not in the web of life long ago woven to its final form. . . . So great a rôle does this question of climate play that the attention of statesmen should be concentrated on it as a very vital question in practical politics. Men, having too long been fully occupied in examining historical causation, may soon be tempted to study climatic influences. There is, in any case, a perceptible pause to be noted in the propagandist activities of the white man, probably because he instinctively realizes that, though his inventions and his forms may be readily accepted, the spirit of the non-white populations of the world remains precisely the same as it has always been; in a word, that no matter how much externals may be altered, men retain cer-

[1] Buckle, Henry Thomas, *History of Civilization in England*, Vol. I, p. 39.

tain unalterable qualities and ideas which are rooted in climate and environment.[1]

This is an extreme view which Mr. Weale himself modifies, now on one side by emphasizing color, and now on another by recognizing universal truths which are above climate. Finot and Bagehot balance the climatic environment with the hereditary trend, itself in part the product of long environmental influence. And they also recognize the moral elements involved.

Climate and "physical" surroundings, in the largest sense [says Bagehot] have unquestionably much influence; they are one factor in the cause, but they are not the only factor; for we find most dissimilar races of men living in the same climate and affected by the same surroundings, and we have every reason to believe that those unlike races have so lived as neighbors for ages. The cause of types must be something outside the tribe acting on something within—something inherited by the tribe. . . . Old writers fancied (and it was a very natural idea) that the direct effect of climate, or rather of land, sea, and air, and the sum total of physical conditions varied man from man, and changed race to race. But experience refutes this. The English immigrant lives in the same climate as the Australian or Tasmanian, but he has not become like those races; nor will a thousand years, in most respects, make him like them.[2]

And Finot says:

Man, like all organic beings, is subject to the influence of the *milieu,* the factor which dominates all the transforma-

1 Weale, *The Conflict of Color*, pp. 131-133, 265.
2 Bagehot, Walter, *Physics and Politics*, pp. 183, 184.

tions which take place in nature. Besides this force, acting slowly during an interminable number of centuries by way of modification, there is another which seems to modify its influence in working by way of preservation. This second force is heredity, owing to which acquired characteristics tend to persist in the rising generations. . . . Climate acts directly on man and animals. . . . The moral causes, such as the liberty which people enjoy, the consideration of which they are assured, the wholesome sentiment of equality before the law and the respect of human dignity, the instruction which is given them, the national system of taxation which contributes to their comfort, the facility of internal and external communications, the way in which the State exercises its privileges and monopolies, justice which respects all the legitimate aspirations of citizens, and as many other conditions of a healthy development of a country, have all likewise their counter-effect on the physiological formation of human beings.[1]

3. *Race, Nationality, and Language*

Race and nationality and language are three closely associated but by no means identical elements. They are found in a great variety of inclusive and exclusive relationships. Nationality and race are not synonymous. Mr. Stoddard draws a sharp but untenable distinction between them. He says:

As a matter of fact they connote utterly different things. Nationality is a psychological concept or state of mind. Race is a physiological fact, which may be accurately determined by scientific tests such as skull measurement, hair formation, and color of eyes and skin. In other words, race

[1] Finot, *Race Prejudice*, pp. 129, 137, 149.

is what people anthropologically *really* are. Nationality is what people politically *think* they are.[1]

But, as a matter of fact, it might be as truly maintained that nationality is physiological and race psychological. Nationality is associated with physical geography, political institutions, and all the material expressions of an organized corporate life. And race, as ethnologists acknowledge, cannot be accurately determined by scientific physiological tests. It has been for this reason that all really scientific race tests have been discarded and the crude sign of color adopted as the only acceptable mark of race distinction.[2]

The lines of nationality and race frequently overlap. Many races may be embraced in one nationality, as in India or in the United States, and there may be many nationalities in one race, as indeed there are, in every one of the great races of the world. In modern history the more powerful of the two ideas, nationality and race, has been nationality. It has divided races which were homogeneous, and it has also forced into unwilling assimilation races which were divided. It is clear that race is not the final fact so often alleged. If it is so solidly and indestructibly fixed in physiological character, how is it that an institution like nationality can overpower and obliterate it?[3] After surviving for centuries in the Balkans, the ancient ethnographic composition of the people, in spite of its supposed physio-

[1] Stoddard, *The New World of Islam*, p. 158.
[2] See Finot, *Race Prejudice*.
[3] Reinsch, Paul S., *World Politics*, pp. 3-5.

logical stability, was engulfed by nationalistic forces, and the perpetuation and confusion alike of the racial groups has been determined by the strength or the weakness, not of race feeling or character but of nationalistic energy, sometimes measurably synonymous with race, but often blurring the racial lines.[1]

Likewise language and race are not to be too closely bound together. And yet there are those who hold language, and the mind which language expresses, to be the great racial criterion. On the other hand, Georges Rodenbach declares that a common language and the mind behind it transcends the bounds of nationality and race. "In truth," he says, "those who are of French nationality often feel themselves to be more different from one another than from a foreigner writing in French." [2]

It is obvious that language is not a racial mark. Language is certainly of far greater consequence than type of hair or color of skin. Two men speaking the same language have far more in common than two men speaking different languages but of the same type of hair and color of skin. Language is no proof of racial affinity, but, on the other hand, (1) a race that did not have a common language would be heavily handicapped by that lack, (2) the unity of race character is futile

[1] See "Report of the International Committee to Inquire into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars," pp. 21-28. See Sloane, *The Balkans, a Laboratory of History*, p. 292: "In particular the dogma that nationality, ecclesiasticism, and consanguinity (i.e., race) are the foundations of political efficiency has been discredited."

[2] Quoted by Jean Finot in *Race Prejudice*, p. 195.

against the lack of a means of communication, (3) people who have the same means of communication in language are united by a bond of mental kinship which their difference in color or race cannot annul. Once again it is clear that race is not the ultimate and sovereign fact in human relationships.[1]

The lesson from language with regard to the race problem is still deeper. As the writer of the article on "Ethnology and Ethnography" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* says:

> Perhaps the greatest psychical proof of man's specific unity is his common possession of language. Theodore Waitz writes: "Inasmuch as the possession of a language of regular grammatical structure forms a fixed barrier between man and brute, it establishes at the same time a near relationship between all people in psychical respects. . . . In the presence of this common feature of the human mind, all other differences lose their import." [2]

4. Race and Communications

We do not need to go further than England and the United States for illustrations of the effect of isolation and communication upon racial and community character. The mountain people of our Southern States are as pure a branch of the old Anglo-Saxon stock as can

[1] Kulamer, John, "Americanization; the Other Side of the Case," in *Atlantic Monthly*, March, 1920, p. 422.

[2] *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Vol. IX, p. 850. See also Ratzel, Friedrich, *The History of Mankind*, Vol. I, Book I, Chap. 5, "Language"; *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, paper by D. S. Margoliouth on "Language as a Consolidating and Separating Influence," pp. 57-61; Roemer, *Origin of the English People and the English Language*, p. 375.

be found in America. But geographical isolation has wrought in them racial characteristics, perhaps with physiological marks in texture of hair or color of eyes or cranial or cephalic index, but certainly with a distinct effect in mental qualities. The early Colonies, and to almost as great an extent the present States, are marked by clear sectional characteristics, due to inheritance and physical environment in part, but also to the nature of their communications. In England and Scotland there are innumerable pockets of humanity where isolation, often within sight of a city, has left its deep results. Greek historians have always found the explanation of much of the character and history of Greece in the physical configuration of the peninsula. The idea of a racial germ plasm, fixing irrevocably the character and destiny of those who inherit it, is treated with small respect by geography, and by the influences which flow from communications.

Undoubtedly the isolation of peoples, under the diverse conditions of their life, is what accounts for the racial diversity of humanity. Even the believer in racial germ plasm has to recognize this or give up the conception of the common origin of humanity which both science and revelation proclaim. Somewhere far back his germ plasms were all one. What differentiated them? How can he know that the forces and conditions which did that cannot undo it; or, if there may be a better ideal, as we believe there is, than undoing this long work of time, how does he know that new condi-

tions and forces may not fulfil that better ideal? May it not be that adequate physical and spiritual communications between men will bring about in the whole of humanity that which the lack of communications will have prepared men to accept with an understanding and capacity which they acquired through their education in isolation?

The late Professor Reinsch worked out these ideas suggestively in a paper on "Influence of Geographic, Economic, and Political Conditions":

Nationalism first grew in Greece and Italy, protected by mountains and by the sea, and in the modern world it was England, whose insular position enabled her first to develop a self-conscious and independent national life. In Africa the absence of such boundaries has contributed to hinder the development of civilization. The tribes are not settled long enough, nor are their boundaries sufficiently fixed for them to develop those qualities which are based upon stability of location. . . . The growth of world unity which we have witnessed in our day has already modified, and even superseded to some extent, the effect of geographic separation, of political nationalism or particularism, and of economic exclusiveness. Economic and social forces are beginning to flow in a broad natural stream, less and less hampered by dynastic and partisan intrigue, by protectionist walls, by monopolies and all sorts of exclusive privileges. . . . We may here ask whether this development does not introduce a danger or resuscitate an old peril under a new form? We have seen that humanity needed local protection against the indiscriminate onslaughts of the mass. Now that natural boundaries have ceased to be determining factors on account of the supremacy of the human mind over physical conditions, is it not to be feared that humanity will be reduced to

an indiscriminate mass lacking distinction—in a word, that it will be vulgarized and barbarized? We are still in need of cores or nuclei about which human self-consciousness may gather. It is here that the usefulness of nationalism, with its ideals, lies. When the physical conditions which gave it birth have lost in relative importance, humanity is, nevertheless, still in need of that distinguishing national self-consciousness under which its ideals and achievements will be further protected and developed. As mere localism, the national idea has lost force. As a means by which values fixed and gained in the struggle of history may be preserved for the future, it still has a meaning and importance. . . . The civilized nation today will recognize that its aim is humanity and that the mission of its policy transcends by far the limits of geographical boundary, but we cannot as yet dispense with these nuclei of human force and ideals which history has developed. They are the great personalities which make up the system of civilized states. When their work is fully done, they will pass away, but for a time still it will be their mission to organize the efforts of humanity to higher ends and to protect mankind against engulfment in an indiscriminate mass, with a lowering of all ideals.[1]

These are thoughts to which we shall return.

[1] Reinsch, Paul S., "Influence of Geographic, Economic, and Political Conditions" in *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, pp. 50, 51, 53, 55. Mr. Lasker would qualify Reinsch's view. He writes: "As a matter of fact, nationalism does not, as Reinsch says, protect racial ideals and achievements. The finest German culture, for instance, is found not in Germany, but in Holland. Flemish ideals and culture are exposed to corroding forces in Belgium. The nationalism of all the larger nations, America not excluded, has had the effect of gradually eliminating the distinguishing features of the culture and traditions of the separate elements of population that constitute the nation. In short, nations are not nuclei, as Reinsch calls them, but on the contrary artificially constructed groupings of nuclei of civilization which they ever tend to destroy."

5. *Race and Social Ideals*

The social relationship which is most closely related to race and which throws most light upon it is sex. Race, as has been said, is just expanded family, and family rests on sex. The conception of woman's position is one of the central elements in race social inheritance and education. The higher the conception of woman, the higher the race. The higher the race, the higher its conception of woman.[1]

The facts of sex suggest some significant lessons with regard to the race problem:

(1) It is undeniable, as Goldenweiser says, that sex division has given rise to a set of formal and functional divisions in society. Sometimes these have implied or involved disabilities on the part of women, but often they have not done so. They have represented simply specialization of service. In primitive societies and in modern communities also the decision has sometimes rested on the idea of woman's inferiority and sometimes of her superiority. As modern society has advanced, the inferiority conceptions have been progressively discarded. This struggle for sex equality is analogous to the struggle for race equality. If it has involved the loss of any values, it has meant the gain of others. It has not destroyed any real facts of difference. It has simply erased artificial and unreal discriminations

[1] Ratzel, Friedrich, *The History of Mankind*, Vol. I, Book I, Chap. 12; Parsons, Elsie Clews, *The Family: An Ethnographical and Historical Outline;* Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, Chaps. XII, XIII; *Report of the Balkan Commission*, p. 271.

which hampered and impoverished society. We have thus a division deeper and more permanent than race, and really physiological, which recognizes functional differentiation without antipathy or discrimination. If this can be for sex, why not for race?

(2) Race antipathies have always melted before sex. Between all races there has been either inter-marriage or intercourse without marriage. We shall consider the whole question of inter-marriage presently. Here it will suffice to state that the alleged sense of race superiority or finality vanishes before the fact of sex. The moral values of life do not so vanish. They take on new solidity and inviolability. Not so with race. It is such a feeble principle that it is one of the first to crumble on the line where the sexes meet.

(3) The struggle for the emancipation and equality of women has been and is still related to the struggle against war.

"It may be noted," says Goldenweiser, "that the basic politico-economic disfranchisement of woman goes back in the main, to a more primary fact; namely, the monopolization by man of the weapons and acts of war. Thus the tragedy of woman symbolizes, in the last instance, the enslavement of the powers of peace by the powers of war." [1]

The same thing is true of the tragedy of race prejudice and conflict. It rests on the philosophy of force. Mr. Weale dismisses the Liberian experiment with the words:

[1] Goldenweiser, *Early Civilization*, p. 264.

It was attempted in an age when philanthropy thought that vague abstract principles could be applied to racial questions irrespective of the particular nature of those problems. It attempted to do by kindness (which is only a fleeting emotion) that which can only be performed by brute movements, grounded in human nature—that is, by the use of force called into action by an imperative demand, such as the necessity to find elbow-room, to find food. To beat aside those who would stay such natural movements by mere arguments is a very natural corollary.

Following this line of thought, it is somehow not impossible to believe that one day the West Indies may be invaded by great swarms of black men, unless they are stopped by force. . . . Humanity has hitherto only concerned itself with such debatable themes as the ill-treatment of blacks by whites. The day may not be far distant when men will pause and openly wonder whether in the past they have been well advised to interfere at all with solutions which, though barbarous, are only so because men, when they are face to face with elementary facts, can only use elementary methods.[1]

So long as this philosophy of the supremacy of the jungle forces in human life prevails, the race and sex problems are both impossible of solution. The races which deem themselves superior will oppose race justice exactly as men opposed sex justice. The achievement of justice and equality must go hand in hand with the triumph of the powers of peace and reason over the powers of unreason and war. As reason and peace come to prevail, sex and race come to their rational adjustment and function in humanity.

[1] Weale, *The Conflict of Color*, p. 241 f.

6. *Race and Religion*

What is the relation of religion to race and the race problem? Is religion determined by race or is it a force which may be counted upon to mold and determine race?

"Looking at things upon a large scale," says Buckle, "the religion of mankind is the effect of their improvement, not the cause of it."[1] And Professor E. A. Ross holds that in religion the racial inheritance and education is decisive, not vice versa:

> Every man denies that his faith is restricted or thrust upon him by circumstances. On the contrary, he imagines that it is a matter of intelligent free choice. But this is an illusion. The recognized ascendency of remote historical factors in determining the religious preferences of peoples emphasizes how non-rational and unfree are the religious adhesions of men.[2]

Is religion a divisive force, provocative of war, or is it consolidating and unifying?

> Differences of language and custom—and, above all, of religion—serve to intensify the hostility (of race) [says Fouillée]. All religion is sociological in character, and expresses symbolically the conditions native to the life or progress of a given society. The religion of a race converts it into a huge society animated by the same beliefs and the same aspirations. Moreover, all religion is intolerant, and hostile to other religions. It believes itself to be the truth, and thus seeks to universalize that which is only the particular spirit of one race or one nation; e.g., the Jewish

[1] Buckle, *History of Civilization in England*, Vol. I, p. 256.
[2] Ross, E. A., *Social Psychology*, p. 8.

spirit, the Christian spirit, the Mohammedan spirit. When, then, the ethnic consciousness becomes at the same time a religious consciousness, the assertion of the individuality of a race implies a counter-assertion to the individuality of other races. It is hidden warfare, passing over at the very first opportunity into open warfare.[1]

Fouillée is speaking of the divisive influence of ethnic religion, but he believes in no universal religion which would unite all men as an ethnic religion helps to unite the race which believes it.

For the sociologist [adds M. Fouillée] there is but one practical means of bringing races together, and that is to diffuse scientific, moral, and social instruction as widely as possible. Instruction of this kind spread gradually among the different nations is the one great means of ensuring peace.[2]

Are all religions alike in this matter of their influence, or is there any special claim that may be made for any one of them as truly adapted to promoting world unity? Two answers are given, apart from what we would regard as the Christian answer. One is that all religions are alike, that it is only a "pretext that one religion is more moral or more civilizing than another," and that any racial customs repugnant to the sentiment of humanity should be indirectly mollified by ethical processes and not by religion.[3]

[1] Fouillée, Alfred, "Race from the Sociological Standpoint," in *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, p. 25.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[3] *Ibid.*, paper by Professor Guiseppe Sergi, on "Differences in Customs and Morals and their Resistance to Rapid Change," p. 72.

The second answer is that religion has a consolidating function, but that it will be religion not crystallized or formulated into a creed or racialized, but religion conceived as a universal human instinct. As Rhys Davids says:

> As an instinct, deep-rooted in the heart, religion transcends the barriers of race, in offering the bond of a common aspiration between individuals. And as the day of dogmas wears on to its long twilight, and the true inwardness of religion becomes acknowledged, we may come to invert the relation between religion, as pretext, and other motives, calling themselves by its name.[1]

But these questions may all be given a different answer. In primitive society we know that religion and life covered the same sphere. The fellowship of religion and of kin are the same fellowship.[2] The Old Testament shows us a human race emerging from a tribal condition and growing into an organized theocratic state. The race was consolidated and given character by its religion. In our view it was not so much the Hebrews who produced their religion. It was rather their religion which produced the Hebrews. And throughout the East whatever may have been the origin of their religions, "the force which united people in obedience to their governments," and provided the chief influence of racial and national cohesion has been mainly religious. This is "true of races

[1] *Ibid.*, paper by Rhys Davids on "Religion as a Consolidating and Separating Influence," p. 66.

[2] Smith, W. Robertson, *The Religion of the Semites*, pp. 30, 47, 50.

so distant and different from the Semitic people as the Chinese and the Japanese." [1]

There can be no doubt of the consolidating influence of the great race religions each within its own race, and—omitting Christianity for the moment—in the case of Buddhism at least there can be no doubt of the influence of religion in overspreading the bounds of race and if not unifying race divisions, nevertheless in a real sense modifying their sharpness.

Among the primitive people with their spirit-worship and their spirit-fear, their fetishes and their taboos, religion is both an internal bond of the race and a bond between races as truly as it has been the occasion of racial strife.[2] Back of all the developed religious conceptions and the ethical philosophy of the Chinese, De Groot finds a "Universalistic Animism": "The primeval form of the religion of the Chinese and its very core to this day is Animism. . . . In China it is based on an implicit belief in the animation of the universe and of every being or thing which exists in it." [3] Such a conception is comprehensive of many differences. It is its influence, in fact, which has unified the Chinese world view and race sense. As Animism works out practically, however, it is too inchoate and motley, too full of fear, to serve as an enduring race cement or to bind together conflicting race interests.

Hinduism has never aspired, save under influences

1 Curtis, *The Commonwealth of Nations*, p. 5.
2 Le Roy, *The Religion of the Primitives;* Nassau, *Fetichism in West Africa.*
3 De Groot, J. J. M., *The Religion of the Chinese*, p. 3.

generated by its contact with the West, to be anything but an ethnic religion. Its principle of comprehension, even of contradictory principles and ideas, is a principle of toleration but not of organization or unity. Its unifying power in India has indeed been great, but only because it has identified itself with caste, which is the religious consecration of racial and social distinctions accepted as the unalterable human order. And it did not recognize its unsocial and inhuman inadequacy as revealed in its exclusion, from both society and religion, of the outcastes, comprising one fourth of the Hindu population of India, until it was brought into comparison with Christianity and with its democratic idea and its principle of the unity of the human race.

Buddhism is the one non-Christian religion which most nearly proclaims the universal principle. The great emperor Asoka, who united nearly the whole of India under his sceptre in the third century B.C., sought to consolidate all the races under his rule by the extension and organization of Buddhism, and it was as a result of his activity that Buddhism spread into China. But the dominant pacifist and passivist ideas of Buddhism have made it ineffective even as a race cement and still more as an interracial bond. Hinduism annulled it in India. And it was no more effective in preventing war between the two greatest Buddhist nations of China and Japan than the Christianity of Germany and France was effective in preventing the World War.

"Surviving as a fossil even in Buddhism," says Rhys

Davids, "the very gospel of mutual toleration and amity, where the term 'Ariya' has come to mean, not race-complacency but ethical excellence, hate of the alien as alien and not only as infidel, appears too obviously in religious wars to need exemplifying." [1]

And today one may see the King of Siam ineffectually striving to use Buddhism once again as the inspiration of national personality. But the power of the faith in unifying either one race or two is gone.

Mohammedanism set out, like Buddhism and Christianity, to embrace all races, but in two respects it differed from them. It did not propose to rely upon moral force alone, and its strong policy of inward consolidation was accompanied by a fiercer policy of outward exclusion. No apology can destroy the evidence of violence in the extension of Islam.[1] But this very violence worked as a force of racial unification among the people who accepted it. Says Bishop Lefroy:

> It is, indeed, one of the most striking proofs of the strength of the creed of Islam that it does thus force into the background—at any rate, to a considerable degree—the distinguishing racial characteristics of the peoples to which it has come, and supersede them by a mind, a character, a life which is primarily and unmistakably the outcome of the creed itself.[3]

For Mohammedanism itself is not and cannot be a solvent of the race problem. It has no conception of the

1 Davids, Rhys, *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, p. 64.
2 Haines, *Islam as a Missionary Religion.*
3 *Mankind and the Church*, p. 281.

Fatherhood of God! How can it have of the brotherhood of man? "Outside of the Mosque," Sir Narayan Chandavarkar told me once in Bombay, "there is no brotherhood in Islam." That was a sweeping statement. But in a deep sense it is true, as life in Persia or Turkey or India proves. Islam has no conception of corporate racial unity, much less of corporate human unity.[1] Bad as the failure of other peoples and other religions to deal with race problems may have been, the worst failure in the modern world has been in the case of Turkey and Islam and the Armenians. Christianity could stand to be judged against Islam by the difference between the Armenian problem in Turkey and the Negro problem in the United States.

7. *Christianity and Race*

And yet it is of the futility of Christianity as a force toward the solution of the race problem that some students of the race problem are assured. Not all; Mr. Stoddard approves of missionary effort: "In as far as he is Christianized, the Negro's savage instincts will be restrained and he will be disposed to acquiesce in white tutelage."[2] Christianity is a desirable soporific for race assertion! But Mr. Weale thinks religion a negligible factor in race development:

> It is, of course, due neither to religion nor to polygamy that Europe and Asia are different—since these are rather

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 290-298.
[2] Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color*, p. 96 f.

results than first causes. Climate, soil, and environment are the great first causes of the difference—climate alone being a sufficiently powerful factor, as those who have resided in hot climates know, to produce in a few generations the most remarkable changes.[1]

And Réné Gerard likewise sees religion as only an effect and not a cause:

> When the vital instinct of a people is healthy, it readily suggests to the people the religious and moral doctrines which assure its survival. . . . It is not, therefore, because a people possesses a definite belief that it is healthy and vigorous, but rather because the people is healthy and vigorous that it adopts or invents the belief which is useful to itself. In this way, it is not because it ceases to believe that it falls into decay, it is because it is in decay that it abandons the fertile dream of its ancestors without replacing this by a new dream, equally fortifying and creative of energy.[2]

This view is not reconcilable with history. The great religions were not the product of great races at the apex of their vital instinct. Every one of them had a humble beginning. The great moral ideas were not generated by civilizations in their power. And on the other hand, a race with no alteration whatever in its heredity or vigor has been again and again shaken or shattered or remade by "philosophic and religious doctrines." Color and climate are not the fundamental things. There is truth which is under all and over all, inde-

1 Weale, *The Conflict of Color*, p. 31.
2 Gerard, Réné, L., "Civilization in Danger," in *The Hibbert Journal*, Jan., 1912, p. 284.

pendent of geography, "common to all humanity, determining history and life." [1]

We believe that Christianity is this truth and we come now to consider the relation of the Christian religion to the race problem.

Christianity found in the Roman Empire a dream of political world unity, a noble effort to realize that dream and the realization that the effort had failed and that some other principle of unity must be found. The extent to which Rome had unified the world was one of the most notable elements in the preparation of the world for the expansion of the Christian religion.

But though the ground had been made ready for the sowing, the old world lacked the living seed. Notions were in men's minds which prepared the way for Christianity, but they lacked the definiteness and the energy needed to make them effective. Everything, indeed, as Uhlhorn says, "was nothing more than preparation. The old world was not able to produce from itself a Christian universalism." [2]

From the very beginning Christianity came into the world with the stamp of universality (Luke 1:79; 2:14, 32; 3:6). One of Jesus' earliest sermons gave great offense because He laid emphasis on the outreaching grace of God. Elijah, He pointed out, had been sent to none of the widows of Israel in the days of famine but to a Sidonian woman, and Elisha had cleansed no lepers of Israel but only Naaman, the

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 289 f.

[2] Uhlhorn, Gerhard, *The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*, p. 27 f.

Syrian. "And they were all filled with wrath as they heard these things" (Luke 4:25-29). The same spirit of nationalistic narrowness, from which Jesus was free, found expression in the sneer of the Jews at Jesus' declaration, " 'Ye shall seek Me and shall not find Me; and where I am, ye cannot come.' The Jews therefore said among themselves, 'Whither will this man go that we shall not find Him? Will He go unto the Dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?' " (John 7:34, 35).

This contrast between the attitude of Jesus and the attitude of the Jews is sharply presented in their relations to the Samaritans. The Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans (John 4:9), and when they would be especially bitter and contemptuous in their reference to Jesus they said to Him, "Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil" (John 8:48). The later tradition declared, "It is forbidden to eat bread or to drink wine with the Samaritans." But Jesus ignored and violated these restraints. "He went and entered into a village of the Samaritans" (Luke 9:52). He sent his disciples into a Samaritan village to buy food and welcomed the people of the village to faith and discipleship (John 4:39-42). And He deliberately gave to a Samaritan a place in one of his most exquisite parables above Levite and priest (Luke 10:33). It was significant that the first people to recognize the universal mission of Jesus were Samaritans. "We know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world," they said. (John 4:42.)

Throughout, Jesus would admit no narrower field of work and salvation for Himself than the world. There are apparently contradictory statements. "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 15:24). "Go not into any way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans" (Matt. 10:5). Jesus had to make a beginning. His immediate mission was to Israel. The only way in which any larger mission could be made possible was by the discharge of this mission to the Jews. A salvation for all was to be wrought out in time and space, and until the work was done the field was confined. But beyond all the immediate and preparatory work lay the universal reaches of a redemption for all mankind. Jesus was such a good Israelite in order that the mission of Israel might be fulfilled and there be henceforth neither Jew nor Greek. Accordingly, the whole spirit and message of Jesus were universal. "God sent not his son into the world to condemn the world but that the world through Him might be saved" (John 3:16, 17). He contemplated the conviction of the world (John 16:8; 17:21, 23), and the preaching of his gospel among all nations (Matt. 12:21; 26:13). And even before his coming, He said, the Father had intended the temple to be a place of prayer for all nations (Mark 11:17), while now all local limits were set aside and everywhere true worshippers were invited to come immediately to the Father without temple and without priest (John 4:20-24).

Jesus told of a good Father over all (Matt. 5:45-48),

of a light in Himself as adequate for all guidance (John 8:12), of Himself the only way to the Father (John 14:6), and as the truth and the life (John 14:6). In view of all this the nation in which He was could be the starting point only, not the goal. His gospel was a message for all men everywhere.

The Book of Acts in the New Testament is a drama of the unfolding universality of Christianity. (Acts 1:8; 2:5-11, 39; 3:25; 4:12, 24; 6:1, 9; 8:5, 27; 9:15; 10:28, 34 f., 43; 11:12, 17, etc.). The Tubingen school of critics rewrote the history in terms of a feud between Paul and Peter as representing the two attitudes to the race problem with which we are confronted today, the attitude of human equality and the attitude of Nordic race aristocracy. There was no such feud, but there was a real struggle in Paul's own mind and in Peter's (Acts 10) as to the right solution of the race issue and the real necessity of a living acceptance of the new and revolutionary doctrines of "the brethren who are of the races" (Acts 15:23) and of the organic unity of mankind. To see how vivid the teaching of Christianity was, open the New Testament and read it again, substituting the word "races" for "Gentiles." (Cf. Matt. 12:21; Mark 10:42; Acts 9:15; 10:45; 11:18; 14:27; 28:28; Rom. 1:13; 3:29; 11:25; 15:11 f., 16; Eph. 3:6; I Thess. 2:16; I Tim. 2:7; I Peter 2:12.) And read anew its reference to Greeks and barbarians. (John 12:20; Acts 14:1; 15:4; 19:10; 20:21; Rom. 1:14; 10:12;

I Cor. 1:24.) And note the great utterances of Paul in Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11; and Eph. 2:11-22.

Of all the foolish words spoken today none are more foolish than those spoken in depreciation of Paul. The idea that he narrowed the gospel and shadowed its freedom and joy is as wide of the truth as any idea men ever conceived. It was the truth of God which was given to him to speak which saved the Roman Empire from dissolution for a thousand years and which is yet to save and unify mankind.

Now it is to be recognized at once that Christianity has not as yet thus unified the races. This is sometimes held against it as a reproach and disproof, especially its failure to prevent war. But Christianity is not automatic or self-applying. It can only solve men's problems when men will accept its solution. To the extent that men have accepted it, it has worked.

It has elevated and transformed and unified races. In the case of primitive races it has preserved them from destruction and given them some support against the disintegrating influences of a different social and economic civilization. This has been denied by teachers like Alexander Agassiz.[1] But the testimony is sufficient.[2]

It is a fact which history amply illustrates in India among the low caste people and in Africa among the

[1] *Letters and Recollections of Alexander Agassiz*, p. 369.

[2] See Foster, *American Diplomacy in the Orient*, pp. 108, 114, 117; Dennis, James Shepard, *Christian Missions and Social Progress.*

primitive and savage peoples, that Christianity lifts races. The witnesses are unimpeachable both for competence and for veracity. Of Christianity and the low castes in India, the Government Census Reports witness to "the brilliant achievements of the Christian Missions in their noble work of civilizing and elevating the aborigines in Chota Nagpur," "the moral regeneration of the race (the Mundas)," the uplifting by Christianity of the outcaste.[1] As to the African, the testimony of the Inspector of Schools in Natal will suffice:

> The history of native education in South Africa is the history of South African missions, for it is due entirely to the efforts of the missionaries that the Natives of South Africa have received any education at all, and to this day all but three of the several thousand Native schools are conducted by missionary agencies. . . . It is said that a certain wise old Native chief divided Europeans into two classes; viz., white men and missionaries. The distinction is significant. To the thoughtful Native the white man is the disintegrating force which has broken down his tribal customs and sanctions, and has replaced them with nothing but innumerable and vexatious governmental restrictions introduced for the benefit of the white man. On the other hand, he knows the missionary to be his friend. It is the missionary who educates his children, who writes his letters, who cares for him in sickness and sorrow, who acts as a buffer between him and the local storekeeper or Government official, and whose motives are always altruistic.[2]

Mr. Loram does not exempt missionaries from error

[1] *Census of India*, 1911, Vol. I, pp. 136-139.
[2] Loram, Charles T., *The Education of the South African Native*, pp. 46, 73.

in breaking down good or innocent moral and social customs, but he lays that to human misjudgment and not to Christianity, and he quotes Lord Selborne's statement that the missionaries in South Africa

> . . . should be regarded as the people who have saved the situation, because they are the people who have taken far the most trouble, and who alone have sacrificed themselves in order to ensure that the education of the Native, inevitable from the moment that he came into contact with the white man, should contain something good.[1]

Not only is it a fact that Christianity elevates and unifies low races; it is also a fact that it does it by moral ideas and spiritual force. The climate does not change. The physiology of the race continues the same. It is obvious that climate and physiology are not the determining factors, but that race elevation and unification are moral processes. The competent students of African life recognize this.[2] It is the "moral forces which are chief powers in the progress or recuperation of any race."[3] And this view may be generalized. The development of races and of race relationships is a moral development. It is only secondarily a physical problem. Kidd asserts that we must discard color and heredity as the basis of race judgment.[4] And he proceeds to press this view as furnishing the true judgment of our own race. It is not a matter of white skin

1 *Ibid.*, p. 78. See Ratzel, Friedrich, *The History of Mankind*, Vol. I, p. 65, Watts, *Dawn in Swaziland.*
2 *The Education of the South African Native*, pp. 3, 229.
3 Stewart, James, *Dawn in the Dark Continent*, p. 14.
4 Kidd, *The Control of the Tropics*, p. 98.

or long heads or Nordic heredity. It is a matter of humanity, of strength and uprightness of character, and of devotion to the call of duty.[1]

The Christian ideals and forces are the only salvation of races and the only solution of the race problem.[2] The Christian view has a right to assert itself. If it is the duty of patriotic men to know and spread the biological facts about society, if "the time has come when one cannot be a good citizen without some knowledge of biology," [3] it is still more clearly their duty to know and spread the Christian facts. For Christianity is the judge and standard of all our race judgments and contacts. It is its business, as Lord Meston says, to bring home to us whatever fundamental errors there are in our treatment of national relationships, to point out where in our contact with other races "we have deflected our own standards and our own best traditions, founded on Christian precepts." [4]

But can Christianity bind together alien races? It may unite a race? Can it unite the races? We must proceed to inquire. But meanwhile let it be quite clear to us that this is what it came to do and that if failure comes, the responsibility for it belongs not to Christianity but to man, and that man must not fail, and with God's help need not fail.

[1] Kidd, *The Control of the Tropics*, p. 100 f.
[2] *Mankind and the Church*, pp. 240, 245 f.
[3] Conklin, "Biology and National Welfare," in *Yale Review*, April, 1917, p. 486.
[4] Meston, Lord, "India at the Crossways," in *The East and the West*, Jan., 1923, p. 73.

CHAPTER VI

The Solution of the Race Problem

1. The Solution of Conflict

There are those who see no future different from the past. The story of race in their view will be a story of continued struggle and war. The titles of their books, so frequently cited in these pages, express their view. They see the evidence of conflict all over the world.

Let the brown world once make up its mind that the white man *must* go, and he *will* go [says Stoddard], for his position will have become simply impossible. It is not solely a question of a "Holy War"; mere passive resistance, if genuine and general, would shake white rule to its foundations. And it is precisely the determination to get rid of white rule which seems to be spreading like wild-fire over the brown world today. . . . The crux of the African problem therefore resolves itself into the question whether the white man, through consolidated racial holds north and south, will be able to perpetuate his present political control over the intermediate continental mass.

. . . . . .

[And speaking of the Great War] As colored men realized the significance of it all, they looked into each other's eyes and there saw the light of undreamed-of hopes. The white world was tearing itself to pieces. White solidarity was riven and shattered. And fear of white power and respect for white civilization together dropped away like garments out-worn. Through the bazaars of Asia ran the sibilant

whisper: "The East will see the West to bed!" The chorus of mingled exultation, hate, and scorn sounded from every portion of the colored world.[1]

I have gone through the colored world of Asia twice since the Great War began and heard this chorus nowhere—not one word of exultation, hate, or scorn, but only the common sentiment of grief and shame at the old order and of hope and longing for a better day. No doubt writers of books and manipulators of parties in Asia talk the talk of strife, but the people are weary of the jungle with its raven and its fangs.

We must recognize that there are some who regard the continuance of racial struggle as a good thing. Professor von Luschan of the University of Berlin ended his paper with this note at the Universal Races Congress in 1911:

Racial barriers will never cease to exist, and if ever they should show a tendency to disappear, it will certainly be better to preserve than to obliterate them.

The brotherhood of man is a good thing, but the struggle for life is a far better one. Athens would never have become what it was without Sparta, and national jealousies and differences, and even the most cruel wars, have ever been the real causes of progress and mental freedom. . . .

Nations will come and go, but racial and national antagonism will remain; and this is well, for mankind would become like a herd of sheep, if we were to lose our national ambition and cease to look with pride and delight, not only on our industries and science, but also on our splendid soldiers and our glorious ironclads. Let small-minded people whine about the horrid cost of Dreadnoughts; as long as

[1] Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color*, pp. 83, 89, 13.

every nation in Europe spends, year after year, much more money on wine, beer, and brandy than on her army and navy, there is no reason to dread our impoverishment by militarism.[1]

The classic enunciation of this view of the inevitable continuance of the present order of rival races, with the tables ever turning more and more against the white peoples, is the picture of C. H. Pearson in *National Life and Character.*

The day will come, and perhaps is not far distant, when the European observer will look round to see the globe girdled with a continuous zone of the black and yellow races, no longer too weak for aggression, or under tutelage, but independent, or practically so, in government, monopolizing the trade of their own regions, and circumscribing the industry of the European; when Chinamen and the nations of Hindustan, the States of South America, by that time predominantly Indian, and it may be African nations of the Congo and the Zambesi, under a dominant caste of foreign rulers, are represented by fleets in the European seas, invited to international conferences, and welcomed as allies in the quarrels of the civilized world. The citizens of these countries will then be taken up into the social relations of the white races, will throng the English turf, or the salons of Paris, and will be admitted to inter-marriage. It is idle to say that, if all this should come to pass, our pride of place will not be humiliated. We were struggling amongst ourselves in a world which we thought of as destined to belong to the Aryan and to the Christian faith, to the letters and arts and charm of social manners which we have inherited from the best times in the past. We shall wake to find ourselves

[1] Von Luschan, Felix, "Anthropological View of Race," *Universal Races Congress,* 1911, p. 23.

elbowed and hustled, and perhaps even thrust aside, by peoples whom we looked down upon as servile and thought of as bound always to minister to our needs.[1]

We cannot feel very greatly indebted to those who offer us this as the only solution of the problem of race relationships.

2. The Solution of Segregation

A second solution is offered by those who believe in the isolation and segregation of the races. Some argue that the West should leave the East alone or at least interfere as little as it can. Some years ago a book appeared under the title, *What Social Classes Owe to One Another,* and the answer given was, "Above all, to keep apart." [2]

Generally, however, in the field of race relationships one seldom hears this view urged in behalf of the lower races except as against Christian missions. It is usually advanced in behalf of the white races, either by those who want to protect the supremacy of those races or by those who regard the invasion of other racial territory by white men as right but all invasion of white men's territory by other races as wrong. Mr. Madison Grant represents the first group. He would not even share the white race's ideals with other people: "Democratic ideals, among a homogeneous population of Nordic blood, as in England or America, is one thing,

[1] Pearson, C. H., *National Life and Character.*
[2] Marvin, F. S., *Western Races and the World,* p. 18.

but it is quite another for the white man to share his blood with, or intrust his ideals to, brown, yellow, black, or red men. This is suicide pure and simple, and the first victims of this amazing folly will be the white man himself." [1]

As a matter of fact, the principle of segregation rightly interpreted and applied is a sound and just principle, and essential to the educational processes through which God is putting each race and all humanity. Each people needs room to develop its own character and contribution to the common wealth of mankind. And there is valid ground in this principle for righteous and reasonable immigration laws on the part of the white people, and there is equally valid ground for the claim of other races for protection against white invasions which hinder and do not help their own racial development.

No principle of segregation, however, whether viewed practically or in the form of some chimerical isolation of each race from contact with other races, can solve the race problem. Complete isolation is an absolute impossibility. For good or for ill, and our faith is that it is for good, the intercourse of the races is ever to increase, and the race problem is inherent in that intercourse. All that proper segregation can do is to protect each race in its just rights and liberties, supply it the opportunity of true self-development, and strip the problem of relationships of as many unnecessary friction-contacts as possible.

[1] Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color*, Introduction, p. xxxii.

The problems of race-separation emerge in their most difficult forms in the question of Oriental immigration to the United States and Canada and Australia, in the exploitation of tropical lands and of undeveloped resources in other lands by the entrance of white men, and in the relation of the white and colored races in our own country and South Africa. The third of these is the one that presses most upon our thought.

A social principle of segregation which will protect race rights and personalities on both sides, when two races occupy common ground and live in the same communities, is vastly more difficult than when they live in different continents, and wise men, both white and black, in America, recognize the need of the most sympathetic common study and readjustment here of many relationships. The finest thing in the world today is the way in which the people of the South, white and black, are facing the situation.

Just as the attempt to find a basis of relationship which would be mutually protecting and mutually respecting and self-respecting has been beset with many difficulties and failures among us, so has it been in the contact of races in other continents. The impossibility of race separation, the inevitableness of the contact of commerce, culture, government, and religion in these continents, has brought much wrong and injustice. If these contacts of race with race had been wrong in principle or avoidable in practice, the evil of them would doubtless have outweighed the good. But racial associations are both right and desirable and necessary,

and, much as we lament the evils of them, there is ground for believing that these have been less than the policy of isolation would have entailed. Even with all the horrors of the slave and liquor traffic in Africa, this view may be maintained, and still more of North and South America where the Indians are more numerous and more happy than they ever were in the days before the European conquest.

No isolation of the races is possible. They are mingled now beyond all possibility of separation. The race problem cannot be solved by any futile proposals of segregation. In two cases, the Negro and the Jew, the problem of the relationships of the race is greatest when the race is furthest from that original home where alone it might have preserved its integrity and distinction. Scattered about in other lands, over all continents, these two peoples are losing ever more and more their segregation and are undergoing, whether for good or for evil, an ever extending infiltration of other blood. [1]

3. The Solution of Subjection

A third solution of the race problem is the proposal that the civilized races should rule all the rest of the world. This proposal is now, however, mainly a reminiscence of another day. There was a time when the notion was seriously held.[2] Its echoes can still be heard

[1] Cf. Belloc, *The Jews*, p. 185.

[2] And it is still held. Josey's *Race and National Solidarity* is an unequivocal assertion of the right of the white race to dominate the world and to exploit the other races that it may have adequate leisure for culture and artistic and æsthetic self-development.

in Kipling's *Recessional* and even in *The White Man's Burden.* The white man was to govern the colored man. The governors would supply the character and brains, for compensation and retiring allowance, but there must be no prohibition law, there must be a reasonable laxity in the matter of concubinage, and the colored man must do the chores. Eliminating the immorality and conceiving the task in terms of service, good men preached this doctrine two decades ago. Some thought that the subordinated races really enjoyed their place. Others thought that Anglo-Saxon domination of the world was the predestination of Providence. Nowadays it is pretty generally recognized that that domination is doomed. The race problem is not to be solved by white sovereignty over colored peoples. Even in South Africa, where the white race has dominion and is likely to retain it for some time, men see that the repressionist policy as applied to race education and advancement is impossible.[1]

And in general the idea of the subjection of race to race is surrendered. "I do not believe," says the late Lieutenant-Governor of the Northern Province of Nigeria, "that one race can remain subject to another for an indefinite length of time. I hold strongly that fusion, extermination, or the reclamation of liberty of action must sooner or later be the destiny of the subject race." [2]

The race problem is not to be solved by the subjection

[1] Loram, Charles T., *The Education of the South African Native,* pp. 17-20.

[2] Temple, Charles Lindsay, *Native Races and Their Rulers,* p. 78.

of race to race. Economic subjection may be attempted when it is seen that political subjection is impossible, but this too will fail as a solvent of race friction and prejudice. Sooner or later it will aggravate it. The true solution must still be sought.

4. The Solution of Eugenics

A fourth solution which is offered to us is eugenics. As between race and race, eugenics leads us on to the wider question of interracial marriages, but eugenics may deal either with intermarriage between races or with the attempt so to breed any one race as to check tendencies of deterioration or to lift it to higher levels of character and efficiency. The forerunner of our modern race eugenics was Francis Galton. In *Inquiries into Human Faculty* he was thinking chiefly of eugenics within a race, but his view was also interracial.

But the eugenics solution does not appear easy to biologists. Mr. Spiller speaks of it as "the eminently plausible but almost certainly unscientific doctrine." [1] And Professor Conklin writes:

> The eugenical dream of a single human breed in which every individual would be a superman would make a highly organized society impossible; it is an anti-social and wholly individualistic ideal. It would be possible theoretically, though perhaps not practically, to breed a race of men of greater intellectual ability than any the world has known, but if all people were of this highly intellectual type, who

[1] Spiller, G., "The Problem of Race Equality," in *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, p. 38.

would dig coal and build railroads and work in factories or on farms? It is as undesirable that persons of marked intellectual capacity should be forced into mere routine tasks as that persons of small ability should be placed in great positions.

But a great variety of human types is beneficial only if every individual is able to find the work and place in society for which he is best suited, and if those are eliminated from reproduction who are incapable of filling any useful place. Furthermore, the best biological and social results would be obtained if intermarriage occurred only between individuals of similar hereditary types. Such a segregation is no impossible ideal, for it is what takes place naturally and normally where instinct and inclination are not interfered with by purely artificial restrictions and conventions. Even our oldest families are of such mixed lineage that their children vary greatly in intellectual capacity, and it is contrary to instinct and to good breeding for a woman of talent to marry the stupid son of a distinguished family or for a man of genius to marry a shallow-minded heiress. It would be good for society in general and for its individual members in particular if every person were free to find his or her proper level both in occupation and marriage, irrespective of family obscurity or pride.[1]

The eugenic principle is like the principle of segregation—true enough within its right limits and governed by the right spirit. As a process of deliberate breeding of race excellence it is impossible, but as a principle of action to be wrought into the sense of race pride and effort, it is a sound principle, and we need not fear for industry and agriculture which in a per-

[1] Conklin, Edwin Grant, "Biology and National Welfare," in *Yale Review*, April, 1917, p. 481 f.

fected human race would become arts and not drudgery. Society has a right to demand a great deal more in the interest of eugenics than it has been accustomed to demand, and public opinion ought to make marriage as difficult as possible for those who are not fit for it and especially for those who have been unfitted by sin. But here the problem is moral. So far as eugenics can make any contribution to race improvement it will be due to higher moral ideals controlling the character and relationships of men.

5. *The Solution of Amalgamation*

We come next to the difficult question of miscegenation or amalgamation in its relation to the problem of race. On two points the anthropologists appear to be agreed; namely, the facts as to the universal operation of race assimilation in the past and the probable development of the future. The really difficult question is as to the present. And as to the present, the fact of steadily progressing racial intermixture is unquestionable. The real issue is as to what is wise and right and how what is wise and right can be secured.

(1) As to the past. Galton says that the past has left us with nothing but mongrel races. In later Rome there was an almost universal intermixture of blood. Professor Tenney Frank concludes that perhaps ninety per cent of the free plebeians in the streets of Rome in the time of Juvenal and Tacitus had Oriental blood in their veins and he has compiled equally remarkable

statistics for various towns in Italy, Gaul, and Spain. "It is evident," he concludes, "that the whole Empire was a melting pot and that the Oriental was always and everywhere a large part of the ore." [1] Some lay the fall of Rome to this amalgamation. Others believe that Rome got more than she gave and that the foreign elements saved her. What happened in Rome has been going on continuously through history. The specialization of race has been undergoing a vast regeneralization. As Professor Conklin says:

> Existing races have arisen by mutation and hybridization, but they have been established by the *isolation* of certain of these mutants or biotypes. The present tendency to the breaking down of isolation and the commingling of races is a reversal of the processes by which those races were established.[2]

And Ratzel adds:

> A thousand examples show that in all this change and movement the races cannot remain unaltered, and that even the most numerous, counting their hundreds of millions, cannot keep their footing in the tumult that surges around them. Interbreeding is making rapid strides in all parts of the earth.[3]

[1] Frank, Tenney, *American Historical Review*, Vol. XXI (1916), p. 689 ff., quoted in *Western Races and the World*, p. 102.

[2] Conklin, *The Direction of Human Evolution*, p. 47.

[3] Ratzel, Friedrich, *The History of Mankind*, Vol. I, p. 12. See Galton, *Inquiries into Human Faculty*, "Influence of Man upon Race"; Roemer, *Origin of the English People and of the English Language*, pp. 85, 197 f., 212; Taine, *History of English Literature*, p. 71; Dixon, *The Racial History of Man*, p. 516; Durand, E. Dana, "The Future of Central Europe," *Atlantic Monthly*, June, 1920, p. 834 f., as to the disappearance of racial marks.

(2) As to the future. Here again the anthropologists agree. Professor Conklin says:

Even if we are horrified by the thought, we cannot hide the fact that all present signs point to an intimate commingling of all existing human types within the next five or ten thousand years at most. Unless we can re-establish geographical isolation of races, we cannot prevent their interbreeding. By rigid laws excluding immigrants of other races, such as they have at present in New Zealand and Australia, it may be possible for a time to maintain the purity of the white race in certain countries, but with the constantly increasing intercommunications between all lands and peoples such artificial barriers will probably prove as ineffectual in the long run as the Great Wall of China. The races of the world are not drawing apart, but together, and it needs only the vision that will look ahead a few thousand years to see the blending of all racial currents into a common stream.[1]

And Professor Dixon of Harvard thinks that the Negroid peoples will hold the tropical heart of Africa,

. . . but for the rest of the world, if the theory here proposed be true, that the racial history of man is in final analysis that of the struggles for dominance among the descendants of differently dowered types, together with their gradual blending into an ever more homogeneous form, the answer to the riddle of the future would seem to be written in the past. The more primitive types and races, those least endowed, must tend to pass from the stage and merge into the complex of their victors, and among these amalgamation and absorption must continue to reduce more and more the remnants of the original types, until in the end, out of many

1 Conklin, *The Direction of Human Evolution*, p. 52.

types, through a multitude of races, may come one race, which will be the consummation of them all.[1]

This is the biological prophecy. We believe that there is a better solution of the race problem than this, that there is a richer destiny possible for man than, to use Professor Reinsch's phrase, "engulfment in an indiscriminate mass," a common amalgam of all human blood.

(3) As to the present. Statements already made indicate how deeply the forces of interracial amalgamation are operating. In Siam and the Malay Peninsula Chinese blood is pouring in a steady flood into the already composite population. The whole of Latin America, as we shall see, is a gigantic experiment in racial intermingling. In India the population is made up of "races as fundamentally differing from each other as any in Europe," [2] but ever more and more melting together. The number of Anglo-Indians of mixed English and Indian blood has been increasing at twice the ratio of the general increase of population in India. The most startling evidence of racial intermixture is in the United States. "There are now one quarter as many mulattoes as full-blooded Negroes in the United States, and the former for many years increased at twice the rate of the latter." [3]

Is this mixture of all races good or evil? Some say

[1] Dixon, Roland B., *The Racial History of Man*, p. 523.
[2] *General Report of the Census of India*, 1881, p. 8.
[3] Conklin, "Biology and National Welfare," *Yale Review*, April, 1917, p. 479; East, Edward M., *Mankind at the Crossroads*, pp. 141-145.

good. Some say good within limits. And some have a different answer.

(1) Some say good. Man is one species and race intermarriage is not an attempt at hybridization of different species. The fertility of human cross breeding, it is contended, is its biological justification.

Professor Finch argues that "race blending, especially in the rare instances when it occurs under favorable circumstances, produces a type superior in fertility, vitality, and cultural worth to one or both of the parent stocks." [1] "While race blending is not everywhere desirable, yet the crossing of distinct races, especially when it occurs with social sanction, often produces a superior type; certainly such crossing as has occurred tends to prove absurd the conclusions that the dilution of the blood of the so-called higher races by that of the so-called lower races will either set the species on the highway to extinction, or cause a relapse into barbarism." [2]

Permanent racial dominion of any race would seem to be dependent upon its amalgamation with the races it is to rule. It purchases power at the price of its blood.[3] But this is not always a loss. Indeed, as Bagehot shows, this was the way many societies or races were formed.[4]

And Professor Conklin, while disapproving indis-

[1] Finch, Earl, "The Effects of Racial Miscegenation," in *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, p. 108.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 112.
[3] Lyall, *Asiatic Studies*, Second Series, pp. 364 f., 368 f.
[4] Bagehot, Walter, *Physics and Politics*, pp. 68 f., 71.

criminate amalgamation, indulges the thought of an imagined composite race combining all the good of all the races:

> No race has a monopoly of good or bad qualities; all that can be said is that certain traits are more frequently found in one race than in another.
>
> In love of adventure, of discovery, and of freedom within the limits of social order the white race is probably supreme, and these qualities under favorable environment have led to its great scientific, industrial, and political development. In virility, conservatism, and reverence for social obligations the yellow race, as a whole, is probably superior to the white. If the white race worships liberty, the yellow race deifies duty; if the former is socially centrifugal, the latter is centripetal. The brown, red, and black races each have their characteristic virtues and defects which have become proverbial. Every race has contributed something of value to civilization, though there can be no doubt that the white, yellow, and brown races lead, and probably in the order named.
>
> No doubt if all the good qualities of different races could be combined and all of the bad qualities eliminated, the result would be a type greatly superior to any existing race.[1]

(2) Some say amalgamation is good within limits; i.e., between kindred races or between the best of two races even though not kindred. Within the broad color distinctions, those who hold this view would approve of wisely ordered assimilation. They recognize the fact of inextricable mixture already existing, and while some of them deprecate the disappearance of specialized types, like the long-headed, fair-haired, blue-eyed

[1] Conklin, *The Direction of Human Evolution*, p. 51.

North European, they assent to the inevitability of white amalgamation and would assent to similar amalgamation of the other colors. As to marriage between the best individuals of two quite diverse races, there would be greater difference of view. We shall come to a judgment of our own in a moment.

(3) But others deem the intermarriage solution of the race problem the wrong solution. This solution cannot, however, be condemned offhand on the ground that the result of intermarriage between the races will be a product inferior to each race. For two reasons:

(a) Amalgamation often takes place under the worst conditions instead of under the best, on the fringes where too often the weakest and most lawless elements of both races bring together the inferior and uncontrolled qualities of each. Usually it is the men of the supposedly stronger and superior race who take the women of the other race sometimes in lawful marriage, more often in concubinage or in even more indiscriminate relations. And often the laws force upon even legalized marriage and its offspring a degrading status. In South Africa such persons

> . . . are outside the pale of tribal influences; they are not brought within the white community. Yet, as a rule, they are monogamists and conform their lives to civilised usages, and their aspirations, notwithstanding many drawbacks, are impressively towards the legal position of their "white father," objecting to being thrust down to the level of their "black mother"; they do not receive the status which, having regard to their culture, they might fairly claim.[1]

[1] *The Education of the South African Native*, p. 127.

If the best of two races were joined on the highest and worthiest basis the test would be fair, as the illegitimate mixture along a low boundary line can never be.

(b) But even such amalgamations as we have are not to be lightly set down as failures. The Chinese blood is improving the stock of all southeastern Asia. It is a popular misapprehension that hybrids are always inferior to pure breeds or that they resemble the inferior parent. "As a matter of fact it is well known that while some hybrids are inferior to either parent others are superior. . . . Combinations of the best qualities yield only the best types, combinations of the worst characters yield the worst types; and between these two extremes all combinations of good and bad characters occur." [1] A man like Booker Washington was a far better and greater man than the white man who was his father.

But when all has been said that can be said for amalgamation, some things remain to be noted as weighing against it as a solution of the race question.

(a) It cannot be operated on a scale sufficiently great or speedy to solve the race issue. It would be generations, probably centuries, perhaps millenniums, before amalgamation could erase the lines of race; meanwhile the friction and prejudice and mal-relationship which constitute the problem would remain. They might be mollified by the acceptance of the principle

[1] Conklin, "Biology and National Welfare," *Yale Review*, April, 1917, pp. 479, 480.

of race-equalitarianism which the policy of universal miscegenation would imply, but on the other hand any such alleviations would be offset by the certainty of increased friction between the growing hybrid groups and the pure blood groups from which they were composed. Experience shows that this is the case and that the only method of avoiding it in any measure is by the incorporation of the hybrid group in one of the two others, and inevitably in the supposedly lower race. In South Africa the illegitimate son of a native woman by a European father is in law a native.[1] This has been the course pursued in the United States. The race of mixed white and black parentage has been absorbed in the black race. In India the Anglo-Indian or Eurasian community has had a separate status but has stedfastly striven for recognition in the white race. This has led to increased race friction. The new political situation in India is compelling the Anglo-Indians to reconsider this position, and their wisest leaders are advocating their throwing in their lot politically, as they must, and socially, as they ought, with the Hindu people. Racial amalgamation within limits will no doubt proceed and of course it must proceed, as the white blood already in the Negro race will spread more and more and as the Chinese blood will spread in all eastern continental Asia. But the dimensions and acuteness of the race problem will not be diminished and may even be aggravated.

(b) Amalgamation, as has been suggested, imperils

[1] *The Education of the South African Native*, p. 128.

race personality and autonomy and self-development. If a race has fulfilled its mission and needs no further opportunity to work out its destiny and its distinctive contribution to humankind, perhaps it might as well melt into some other race or some new amalgam, but this would be racial euthanasia, not the protection and use of racial freedom and activity. There is no evidence that any of the great races has accomplished its mission. Until it has done so, even though amalgamation may filter in along its margins, it is better that its essential race integrity be preserved. Marcus Garvey's power lay in his appeal to the sense of Negro race personality. "We believe," said he, "in a pure black race just as our self-respecting whites believe in a pure white race, as pure as that can be." [1]

(c) Amalgamation, therefore, which is sometimes urged on the principle of race equality, is in reality the subversion of race equality. So far as it is illegitimate, it is almost invariably an invasion of race equality. Men of a stronger race treat women of a weaker race as they could not treat women of their own. Some Indian writers are inclined to look back regretfully to the early days when Englishmen under the East India Company kept their establishments as a matter of course and left behind them troops of half-breed children. There was once a furious dispute in Calcutta as to whether these children and their mothers were not a legitimate charge against the funds of the Company. And these modern writers imagine that these

[1] DuBois, "Back to Africa," *Century Magazine*, Feb., 1923.

old conditions represented a recognition by the British of race equality. Precisely the contrary. They were an expression of intolerable race inequality. And even when the amalgamation is legitimate, it would certainly imperil race equality if it were on a sufficient scale. It would deprive each race of the conditions requisite to its full freedom and self-expression. No argument is offered here against amalgamation on the grounds of race inequality. And the disapproval of interracial marriage does not imply our surrender of the ideals which this book has maintained. We view the matter just as we view marriage within any one race. All the considerations which counsel good sense, the conservation of moral and physical values, the union of harmonious strains, consideration for offspring, and the rational application of eugenic principles in marriages within a race operate as presumptive objections to interrace amalgamation.

(d) To amalgamate races is to reverse the process of differentiation. There come times when new syntheses are desirable and certainly a new spiritual synthesis of the races is essential, but the progress of nature and of mankind has been a process of enlarging heterogeneity. Amalgamation turns this process backward. All the great gains of humanity have been painfully won by the specialized experience and sacrifice and achievement of the races. We cannot see that this work is yet finished. The races appear still to be necessary to accomplish the tasks for which they came into being.

Three of the instances of racial amalgamation with which we are familiar have some special lessons for us.

(1) The Eurasian peoples in Asia. We know them best in the Anglo-Indian community, as it is now called, rather than Eurasian, in India. Mr. Andrews calls them "a warm-hearted and emotional people, with high qualities of character when properly developed, but apt very quickly to degenerate when left without proper care and training." [1]

The plight of the children of interracial marriage is one of the greatest difficulties in the way of accepting amalgamation as the solution of race. All over the world we see these children and only a heart of stone would be insensible to their plight. Often the white fathers have gone back to the homeland and the little ones are left to work out their colossal problem themselves. Nothing more clearly proves that race honor and color antipathy are secondary forces than the readiness with which the white race has strewn the world with half-breeds. And where white men have gone and have lived in honor and purity, it has been moral forces rather than race pride or color prejudice which have governed them.[2] Possibly the sacrifice of some generations of children and of adult life might be the necessary price of the solution of amalgamation, and possibly there might not need to be any such price if the world were agreed that amalgamation is the wise and right solution. In that case a special respect might

[1] Andrews, C. F., *The Renaissance in India*, p. 285.

[2] "Colored Races in South Africa," in *The East and the West*, Oct., 1922, pp. 330-337.

attach to those who were courageously carrying it through. But as the world is, amalgamation imposes a terrible burden on its offspring in many lands.

(2) South America. South America is an illustration of amalgamation on a continental scale. This was the deliberate policy and ideal of some of the great liberators and leaders.[1] There are still distinct racial divisions in South America, but the mixture of Portuguese and Indian and Negro in Brazil, of Spanish and Indian and Negro in the Caribbean lands, of Spanish and Italian and Indian in Argentina, and of Spanish and Indian in the rest of the Continent has gone further than any mixture of such dissimilar races has gone elsewhere. One third of the population of the Continent is estimated to be of pure white or dominant white blood, one tenth of Indian blood, and all the rest of mixed blood.

Has the result justified the policy of amalgamation? Calderon's present conclusion is that the Latin American democracies

> . . . are degenerate. The lower castes struggle successfully against the traditional rules; the order which formerly existed is followed by moral anarchy, solid conviction by a superficial scepticism, and the Castilian tenacity by indecision. The black race is doing its work and the continent is returning to its primitive barbarism.
>
> This retrogression constitutes a very serious menace. In South America civilisation is dependent upon the numerical predominance of the victorious Spaniard, on the triumph of the white man over the mulatto, the Negro, and the Indian.

[1] Calderon, *Latin America, Its Rise and Progress*, p. 74.

Only a plentiful European immigration can re-establish the shattered equilibrium of the American races.[1]

Lord Bryce's view of South American amalgamation was not so unfavorable, and he saw clearly the fallacy of the idea that race hostility is a primary instinct:

It might seem natural to assume *a priori* that men of pure European race would continue to hold the foremost place in these countries, and would show both greater talents and a more humane temper than those in whose veins Indian blood flows. But I doubt if the facts support such a view. Some of the most forceful leaders who have figured in the politics of these republics have been mestizos. . . . Race repugnance is no such constant and permanent factor in human affairs as members of the Teutonic peoples are apt to assume. Instead of being, as we Teutons suppose, the rule in this matter, we are rather the exception, for in the ancient world there seems to have been little race repulsion; there is very little today among Mohammedans; there is none among Chinese. This seems to suggest that since the phenomenon is not of the essence of human nature, it may not be always as strong among the Teutonic peoples as it is today. Religion has been in the past almost as powerful a dissevering force as has racial antagonism. In the case of Spaniards and Portuguese, religion, so soon as the Indians had been baptised, made race differences seem insignificant.[2]

It would seem, accordingly, that we must allow longer time to the South American experiment before

[1] Calderon, *Latin America, Its Rise and Progress*, p. 362; see also pp. 351 f., 356 f., 360. See also Ross, Edward Alsworth, *South of Panama*, pp. 213, 217, 248.

[2] Bryce, James, *South America, Observations and Impressions*, pp. 477, 482.

passing judgment. And there can be no doubt that if the experiment fails, it will not be solely on ethnological grounds, but because the forces of true education and religion which ought to govern and direct so great a human development were not supplied by other races who under a just and generous principle of race relationships would have done their utmost to assure the success of a racial venture of such significance to all mankind.

(3) The problem of white and black amalgamation. What makes this problem the more difficult is the apparent impossibility of its prevention. The white race has thus far been unwilling to accept any law of race integrity. It proclaims a principle of segregation which it persistently violates. Booker Washington once asked pertinently, "If your segregation wall be high enough to keep the black man in, will it be high enough to keep the white man out?" Some of the southern States have laws forbidding the marriage of white and black. Such a law as established in the state of Illinois entered again and again into the debates between Lincoln and Douglass.[1] In South Africa such marriages are prohibited in the Transvaal. "In the Free State the licenses issued to marriage officers do not permit of the celebration of mixed marriages. In the Cape Province and Natal such marriages can be contracted legally, though the tendency of recent legislation has been to place obstacles in the way of these unions." [2]

[1] *Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln*, pp. 113, 446.

[2] Temple, *Native Races and Their Rulers*, note to preface, p. iv, Addendum.

This book has already stated the broad grounds on which it seems wise to deprecate amalgamation. The special view of the South on the question is stated with characteristic care and sympathy by Mr. E. G. Murphy.[1] The true objection to amalgamation does not rest on color antipathy or on race inequality but upon the principle of race personality, integrity, and mission. Illegitimate amalgamation is the repudiation of color antipathy but also of race equality and integrity. Legalized amalgamation would recognize race equality. Either legitimate amalgamation should be allowed or illegitimate should cease. And the burden of responsibility in the matter is not on the Negro. It is on the white. It is not the Negro who has sought an intermixture with the white race. It is the white race which has forced its blood upon the Negro. The violation of race integrity all over the world is the offense of the white race. The Chinese have matched our race in this matter, but the Chinese have not held our race ideas. It is a curious fact that the race which has most highly exalted the theory of race integrity should have done most to destroy it.

But, it may be asked, if the human race is one and its ultimate goal is a unified humanity, why are not those men and women of various races to be praised who pioneer the road by intermarriage? For two reasons: because the ideal of organic unity is not identical with racial uniformity; and, because, as St. Paul argued in his day for individuals, while races have the

[1] Murphy, E. G., *The Present South*, pp. 275-277.

right to intermarry and it is better for them to intermarry than to burn and far better than to breed an amalgam of illegitimacy, the course of rational race respect and race relationship and race discharge of duty is to be preferred to the course of those who would yield these values for the sake of lesser goods.

6. *The Solution of Christianity*

From the proposed solutions of the race problem which offer us no hope, we turn to the only reasonable and right answer. We are our brothers' keepers. Those who are strong ought to bear the burdens of the weak. We live in the bonds of a universal trusteeship. Color and climate and language and physiological traits are all secondary matters. Heredity and education alike entail obligations, but entitle to no privilege except the privilege of service. All the races are in the world to help one another, to work together for their common good, to build unitedly on the earth a human commonwealth. Even in his gloomy prediction of the day when the white men are to be jostled from their place of supremacy, Mr. Pearson takes comfort in the thought that the white races will themselves have brought the new day in. "The solitary consolation," he adds to the words already quoted, "will be that the changes have been inevitable. It has been our work to organize and create, to carry peace and law and order over the world, that others may enter in and enjoy." [1]

[1] Pearson, C. H., *National Life and Character*, p. 84.

But the entering in of others will not be our exclusion. In their joy, our joy will be fulfilled. And they also will have their contribution to make to us and to all. The right solution of the race problem is the simple solution of justice and righteousness, of brotherhood and good-will. It is quite true that innumerable difficult problems of politics and economics are to be solved and that right thought as well as right feeling is essential but, except on the philosophy that economic and physical determinism is more powerful than moral liberty and social purpose, man is equal, under God and with the guidance and help of God, to the work that is to be done. It involves elements which are already clear to us and, as we go on with courage and a right spirit, other elements will appear.

(1) Races must recognize their economic interdependence and common interests. No race, as we have seen, can permanently profit by the loss of other races. Trade must be mutually beneficial or it cannot endure. Capital must be employed where it can serve all men best, or it will not serve best either its owners or the race to which they belong. It cannot be said that tariffs designed to promote racial or national independence have not their place, but they exceed their limit when they advantage one race to the detriment of the mass of human well-being. Generalizations like these can be multiplied indefinitely. But the principle underlying them is simple and fundamental. Lowell expresses it in a single line in *The Present Crisis:* "In the gain or loss of one race all the rest have equal claim."

(2) This community of racial interest is moral and social as well as economic, and the races must recognize this as an essential element in their solution of the race problem. All races must be lifted or the lower will pull the upper down. Races can fall as well as rise.[1] What Dr. J. L. M. Curry said long ago is clear to all today with regard to the Negro and the white in the South. Unless the white race lifts the black race, "both will be inevitably dragged down." And more truly still, each race is to have part in the lifting of both.

Even where races are not living together, their community of moral and social interest is not less real. The thoughts of every race, like its diseases, are not segregable. There is no quarantine that can wholly bar disease and the barriers against ideas are still less effective. The only safety of any one race is not in isolation but in a pure and clean world.

(3) It is quite true that these are only ideas of which we are speaking, and it is often said that the relations of life are governed, not by these sentimental considerations, but by the hard economic facts. But these ideas are facts. They are the hardest economic and physical facts with which we have to deal. And no one can escape from them. And a third fact, equally hard and equally fruitful of effect with these, is the fact of racial thought and feeling toward other races. The right solution of the race problem requires that each race shall cultivate a feeling of respect and tolerance toward other races, and of sympathy with them

[1] Kidd, *The Control of the Tropics*, p. 50 f.

in struggles which our race has often made more difficult for them. Lord Meston speaks of this in the case of the British race and India:

"We must study the new conditions with a sympathetic endeavor to understand them; and we must look back on our own relations with these Eastern lands, on a good deal for which we have to make amends, but on much else which we have given as a pledge that we mean to give more and of our best." [1]

Each race is bearing a great burden. Napoleon's adage as he met a laborer bearing a heavy load and stepped deliberately out of the way is a good racial counsel: "Respect the burden"—and respect the human bearers of it.[2]

(4) Whatever the advanced races have of knowledge or power, they ought to conceive in terms of trusteeship. There are some today who discredit the idea that the white races are in possession of any great trust for the world. Mr. Pepper thinks that our American literacy is not education and is little to be preferred to the illiteracy of Asia.[3] And Mr. Russell thinks Chinese civilization superior for the Chinese to our own. Nevertheless, these men personally adhere to and make use of the civilization and education they criticize and go abroad to teach the nations. We may not have all that we think we have. Every race, no doubt, exaggerates

[1] Meston, "India at the Crossways," in *The East and the West*, Jan., 1923, p. 77.

[2] See Trollope, Mark, "The Japanese Treatment of Corea," *The East and the West*, Jan., 1923, p. 61.

[3] Pepper, Nathaniel, "The Real Revolt Against Civilization," in *Century Magazine*, June 13, 1923.

itself and its acquisitions and powers. But whatever any race really does have, it holds not for itself alone but for all the races. And we have come at last, after long delay, to what ought from the first to have been, to a sense of trusteeship. Not only do we hold what is ours for all men, but we hold what we have taken over from other races for all men. At last we realize that what we hold of any other race we hold for that race as well as for civilization. Articles XXII and XXIII of the Covenant of the League of Nations embody this acknowledgment and indicate the long distance we have come from the old days of imperialistic expansion.

There are strong races and there are weak races, advanced races and backward races. The problems of their relation will not be solved for many years. But the solution will be hastened by recognition of the principle of trusteeship. Economically that principle is the only sensible principle. The expedition into Mexico after Villa cost the United States $112,000,000. The Mexican unrest of which the Villa incident was a part has cost our Nation and the world vastly more. A small portion of these amounts spent in a spirit of brotherly helpfulness in Mexico in education would have averted all this loss and advanced Mexico on her way by at least two generations.

(5) The right of racial integrity, to be developed wherever possible into national autonomy, should be recognized. The success of civilization would involve the realization of both these ends. They are both con-

sistent with and involved in the ideal of democracy, whether national or universal.

As Mr. Murphy says:

> Democracy does not mean the erasure of individuality in the man, the family, or the race. Its unity is truer and richer because not run in one color or expressed in monotony of form. Like all vital unities, it is composite. It is consistent with the individuality of the man, it is consistent with the full individuality and the separate integrity of the races. No one has ever asserted that the racial individuality of the Jew, preserved for sixty centuries and through more than sixty civilizations, by conviction from within and by pressure from without, was a contradiction of democratic life. Democracy does not involve the fusion of races any more than it involves the fusion of creeds or the fusion of arts. It does not imply that the finality of civilization is in the man who is white or in the man who is black, but in the man—white or black—who is a man. Manhood, in a democracy, is the essential basis of participation.[1]

It is the business of the strong races to help the weak races in the hope that they may be able to stand alone in the exercise of self-government and in the accomplishment of the world's work. The advance of such a democratization is only possible through the recession of Islam, and the approach of any race toward full self-realization means its approach to Christianity.[2]

(7) Is this true? Does the solution of the race problem belong to Christianity?

All the conceptions which have emerged and which

[1] Murphy, *The Present South*, p. 19.
[2] Kinross, Albert, "Islam," in *Atlantic Monthly*, Nov., 1920, p. 680.

are involved in the true view of race and the true solution of the race problem are either broad human considerations rooted in the nature of man or they are distinctively Christian. Historically they came convincingly into the thought of man through Christianity. They derive what vitality and power they possess from the Christian spirit. Three of these great ideals of Christianity may be suggested, in closing this chapter, as fundamental.

(a) Its ideal of equality. Christianity affirms human equality in the sense in which equality is true. The races are not equal in their capacities or achievements or progress. Professor Conklin is quite right: "Every human race has its good qualities and its bad ones, but human history as well as biology refutes those idealists who claim that there are no lower races or types, that all men are born equal." [1] In many respects men are not born equal and even if they were, they would not remain so. And races are only kindred and measurably assimilated groups of men. They differ both by and in inheritance and education and character. But in the true sense Christianity affirms that all men and all races are equal. They have equal rights to justice and to life, to happiness and to work, to self-development and to liberty. They have the capacity each to do his own duty and to fulfil his own functions. Christianity asserts the equal right of man as man to be his best and to do the most, and it asserts this equal right for every man of every race. This assertion is essential

[1] Conklin, *Yale Review*, April, 1917, p. 480.

to the production of the human values which the whole race needs. Any theory of race inequality which prevents this will rob humanity of potential human capacity.[1] Every individual has his right to the freest and largest life, unforbidden because of race connection. And each race has its right to self-fulfilment according to its highest possibilities.

(b) Its ideal of service and love. The military and economic education through which we have passed has derided the sentimental considerations. But love and sympathy and service, nevertheless, are the primary forces. Even the military and economic appeals make use of love of country, and of service to race, and of duty to symbols like the flag, thus confessing the supremacy of the moral sentiments. The race problem will not be solved by men who are driven to the philosophic conclusion that only brotherhood will solve it. Brotherhood is not a force which will come to such a summons. It is to be found only where men look upon other men with a brother's love. The idea and power of such a love is historically and peculiarly Christian. And the great interracial services of the world are still traceable to a Christian source.

(c) Its ideal of unity. The conception of human unity which Christianity has propagated and which resides in its universality of character and claim, has happily spread widely over human thought and effort. Dr. Reinsch has summarized the facts of the new world mind:

[1] Thorndike, Edward Lee, *Educational Psychology*, Vol. III, p. 224.

The cardinal fact of contemporary civilisation is the unification of the world, the emergence of organic relations, world-wide in scope, uniting the branches of the human family in all parts of the earth. . . . Great types of character are no longer merely national household names, but their lineaments are known the world over, and everywhere interest is taken in their views and actions. There is a world-wide sympathy, so that if evil befall in California, or Chile, or Italy, or China, the entire world is affected and all nations are anxious to offer their aid and bear their share of the burden.

The growth of world unity which we have witnessed in our day has already modified, and even superseded to some extent, the effect of geographic separation, of political nationalism or particularism, and of economic exclusiveness. Economic and social forces are beginning to flow in a broad natural stream, less and less hampered by dynastic and partisan intrigue, by protectionist walls, by monopolies and all sorts of exclusive privileges. . . .

While national policy still strives to reserve some special benefits to citizens, the dominant note in industrial life is no longer national, but international. This is also indicated by the manner in which practically every economic interest has organized itself on an international scale. Such great unions as those in which the activities of insurance, of railway management, of shipping, of agriculture, of building, of law, of education, and of science are discussed and acted upon, are the final proof that economic organization has forever abandoned the narrower field and recognizes no confining local limits.[1]

But these unities are frail and need some deeper spiritual basis. And also they need some principle which will protect us against the risk of world uni-

[1] Reinsch, Paul S., "Influence of Geographic, Economic and Political Conditions," *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, pp. 49 f., 54.

formity. A universal social mind filled with the whole world content is our goal, but how is personal and racial individuality to be preserved in it?[1] Christianity has the only adequate assurance. Read again Paul's great passages in I Corinthians 12:12-27, and Ephesians 2 and 3 and 4, and Colossians 1. In the New Testament conception humanity is a body of which Christ is the Savior and Head. The races are members of an organism living one common life, sharing alike the honor and health of the whole body of which each is a part. There is unity of body, variety of function, identity of interest, equality of life and joy.

And deeper yet, as Mr. Mornay Williams writes:

> After all, it is the personal and living Christ, not the body of ideas, or philosophy of life, which most persons have in mind when they speak of Christianity, which is the reconstructive principle. Our Lord's own words are both the explanation and the demonstration of his place and power: "I am the way, the truth and the life." Apart from his person there is no access to the Father or to the unity of mankind. A striking illustration of the inevitableness of this personality of the truth is the scene in Pilate's judgment hall where Jesus, the Word of God manifest in the flesh—the embodied Truth—stood before his Roman judge, who, vacillating and harassed, cried out, "What is truth?" and the next moment, looking to the Jews, said: "I find in Him no fault at all." In much the same fashion the wisdom and science of our modern world faces the problems which confront it, and not least, the racial problems, and as men eagerly question: "What is truth? How shall we conserve the best? How shall we save life, individual life and racial

1 Ross, Edward Alsworth, *Social Psychology*, p. 363 ff.

life? How shall we escape war and bloodshed?" over against them stands the calm figure of Jesus Christ, the King of righteousness and Prince of peace, saying, "I am come that ye might have life and have it more abundantly. Whosoever shall seek to save his life, shall lose it, and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it." In the *Te Deum* of history the noble army of martyrs and the glorious company of the apostles as they praise God, continually affirm and prove the truth of these words for the individual, and gradually, here a little and there a little, the races and families of the earth are spelling out the truth in an anthem of praise that is a deepening echo of the ancient song of peace on earth, good-will to men. For the method of Jesus is to make men friends to one another through Himself and the purpose of Jesus is to create a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

Here is the solution of the race problem. If looking out over humanity, torn with race feuds and embittered with race hatreds, we ask with Paul, "Who can deliver us from the body of this death?" the answer is simple and clear: "Christ is the Savior of this body."

CHAPTER VII

Some Specific Race Problems of Today

1. Relation of White and Negro Races

Our greatest American race problem is the problem of relations between the white and black races. In some respects the situation is more hopeful, in others more alarming than it has ever been. It is more hopeful because among both the black and the white people there is a growing body of the best men and women who realize the gravity of the situation, who are ready to cooperate in dealing with it, who believe that the application of Christianity to the problem is its only solution, and who are convinced that Christianity must now be applied. Indeed, the Christian forces are the only forces which are really grappling with the issue. Why have we been so slow in bringing them to bear upon it? Nothing has ever shown the inadequacy and the helplessness of all other forces in facing a real and perilous race situation more sharply than it has been shown in this matter. And no one can read the literature on this subject of twenty years ago and then the literature which the South is producing today without realizing the immense progress that has been made and the courage and justice and hopefulness with which the Christian people of both races in the South are meeting this real crisis.

Among the evidences of this spirit and as illustrating the right method of approach to race problems, nothing has been more notable than the growth of interracial cooperation, especially since the inauguration of the Southern Sociological Congress in 1912, in Nashville, Tennessee. Its program covered the whole field of social and moral need in the South, and it specifically included among the things for which the Congress stood "the solving of the race question in a spirit of helpfulness to the Negro and of equal justice to both races." It issued "a challenge to Southern chivalry to see that justice is guaranteed to all citizens regardless of race, color, or religion and especially to befriend and defend the friendless and helpless," and "a challenge to the present generation to show its gratitude for the heritage bequeathed to it through the toil and blood of centuries by devoting itself more earnestly to the task of making the nation a universal brotherhood." [1]

As a result of this Congress interracial committees have been established in eight hundred counties, and interracial State Committees also, with larger power and influence, have faced courageously the immense task before them.

The women of the South, both white and colored, have taken their place in this forward movement. They are members of the interracial commissions and, acting both in separate racial groups and together, they are looking the race issue squarely in the face.[2]

1 *The South Mobilizing for Social Service,* p. 13 f.
2 *Home Mission Monthly,* April, 1923.

Thousands of concrete instances of good feeling and good action between white and black could be gathered, and the daily papers could publish ten of these to every contrary instance of bad feeling and bad action. The most significant social fact is the steady patience and the growing intelligence of the Negro race, and the ever-developing purpose of the white race to see that absolute justice is done both to the Negro race and to its individual members.

But this is only the hopeful side of the picture. There is a darker one. Dr. Haynes has described it, as well as the bright side, in *The Trend of the Races.*[1] With growing cooperation between black and white, there is also growing divergence. There are white elements which behave with anti-social hatred and in a spirit of race-arrogance toward the Negro. There are other white elements, too high minded for such an attitude, who, nevertheless, are satisfied with an inadequate ideal of justice for the Negro. There are black men whose patience is worn thin or who despair of a peaceful solution of the problem. And there are black men who are intemperate and who have accepted the war philosophy that the right way to right wrong is by force and violence.

As we face this existing race situation in the United States, what are the most living and significant aspects of the problem?

(1) The most important thing is the temper of mind which will allow time for a solution and which will

[1] Haynes, George Edmond, *The Trend of the Races,* p. 9 f.

assure all parties to the issue that there is an adequate will to reach a just solution. Fortunately, these two essentials are just the qualities with which the two races involved are most strongly endowed. The most notable gift of the Negro race is its patience and long-suffering. In spite of all that the race has endured, it has kept its good spirit and kindness. Its songs are free from all hate and vengeance. They breathe only friendship and stedfastness and hope. When the Negro is asked to be patient a little longer, he is asked only to be his own best self. And, on the other hand, the one thing that the American race can be counted on to come to at last is justice. Many interests may befog the road. Many weak and evil elements in the race may seek to argue that what is wrong is really right, in order that they may worship injustice at the shrine of justice. But sooner or later this nation will see right and will do right.

(2) But what is just and right in the matter of the status of the Negro in America? One thing that is obviously right is full economic freedom and opportunity. That was one of the issues settled when slavery died. Slavery had been the economic bondage both of the slave and of his owner. Emancipation set them both free and left them both penniless. The economic recovery and advancement of the whole South is a romance. But we are concerned now with the Negro. His has been largely the labor which has made the New South. And what has been his share in the new industry and the wealth which he has produced? The Negro race

constitutes between one eighth and one ninth of the total working population of the country. In the South he has been a far larger fraction. Nearly nine tenths of the Negroes in the South over ten years of age are wage earners, and nearly all of them have been employed by white people. The number of the employed in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits more than doubled in the years between 1890 and 1910.

A summary in round numbers will suffice to show the progress of the Negro since the Civil War:

	1866	*1922*
Negro population	4,000,000	10,500,000
Homes owned	12,000	650,000
Wealth	$20,000,000	$1,500,000,000
Farms operated	20,000	1,000,000
Businesses conducted	2,100	50,000
Per cent literate	10	80
Colleges and normal schools	15	500
Students in public schools	100,000	2,000,000
Spent for Negro education	$700,000	$20,000,000
Negroes spent on education	$80,000	$2,000,000
Number Negro churches	700	45,000
Communicants	600,000	4,800,000
Sunday-school pupils	50,000	2,250,000
Value of church property	$1,500,000	$90,000,000

The most significant item in the advance of the Negro is the creation of the Negro home and all that it represents as a social and moral force in the life of the race and the nation.[1] In spite of all that can be charged

[1] Hammond, L. H., *In Black and White*, pp. 90-128; Haynes, *The Trend of the Races*, pp. 41-47, 169-172.

against him in efficiency, the Negro has vindicated his right to full economic freedom and all the rights of association in labor or capital within that freedom, and has proved himself to be a priceless asset to the nation. The South would have been almost economically helpless without him.[1]

(3) The Negro's rights include full political equality. Any limitations of franchise which debar him from voting ought to do so on other grounds than race. They ought to apply equally to all races. The question whether he should or should not have been enfranchised after the Civil War is an interesting but academic question.

Whatever may have been wise in the past, the fact is that under the Constitution of the United States the Negro is explicitly protected against any denial or abridgment of his right to vote "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." This law has been annulled, and its annulment is now made a pretext for the annulment of the Eighteenth, or Prohibition, Amendment as well. Contempt for one law is offered in justification for contempt of the other. There ought to be loyal compliance with both laws. It may well be that there should be qualifications for the suffrage which would disenfranchise Negroes, but the same qualifications should apply to whites as well. And ultimately they will do so. Lord Bryce was on the whole convinced that they should do so, that the Negro should have full political as well as full economic equal-

1 See *The South Mobilizing for Social Service*, pp. 368-397.

ity. He raises the question as the South has faced it, and he replies:

> The answer seems to be that as regards political rights, race and blood should not be made the ground of discrimination. Where the bulk of the colored race are obviously unfit for political power, a qualification based on property and education might be established which should permit the upper section of that race to enjoy the suffrage. Such a qualification would doubtless exclude some of the poorest and most ignorant whites, and might on that ground be resisted. But it is better to face this difficulty than to wound and alienate the whole of the colored race by placing them without the pale of civic functions and duties.[1]

(4) The Negro race should have also full educational opportunity. Not only should there be no educational discrimination against it, but on the contrary, for the sake of the State and of society as a whole, there should be special and preferential care to bring the race onward. The idea of racial intellectual inferiority or incapacity for education is disputable, and even if it were not, it would not be relevant.

It is disputable. Psychological and educational tests among children and in the army have revealed an average intellectual superiority of the white over the black, but the difference has not been great enough to warrant any special racial pride on the part of the white, when the hereditary and educational advantages of the two races are taken into account. And in the case of indi-

[1] Bryce, James, *The Romanes Lecture*, 1902: "The Relations of the Advanced and the Backward Races of Mankind," quoted by Murphy in *Problems of the Present South*.

viduals, many blacks have demonstrated a marked superiority over white comparisons. A worthy list of Negro authors, poets, inventors, painters, musicians, soldiers, doctors, teachers, orators, scientists, preachers, and others proves the capacities and latent resources of the race.

It is life or death to the white race to lift or fail to lift the black race with it. As Dr. Weatherford said at the second meeting of the Southern Sociological Conference:

> The South is a solid South in more than a political sense. We are a solid South in a social sense. I mean whatever affects the social welfare of one man affects the social welfare of every other man in the section. We are bound together by the fact of proximity, we are bound together by economic relations, we are bound together by the traditions of the past, we are bound together by all the forces of present life which demand the guarding of our health, our ideals, and our civilization. We are not eight million Negroes and twenty million whites; we are twenty-nine million human beings, and whatever affects one of our company must of necessity affect all the other 28,999,999. The sin of the immoral will destroy the safety of the moral, the disease of the weakest will destroy the health of the strongest, the prejudice of the most ignorant will warp the judgment of the most learned, the lawlessness of the most criminal will blacken the fair name and drag into criminal action the law-abiding instincts of the highest citizens. We must stand or fall together.[1]

(5) The Negro situation in the United States, both in the South and in the North, has been radically al-

[1] *The South Mobilizing for Social Service*, p. 359 f.

tered by the startling redistribution of the race. A generation or two ago the South had a Negro population in some states equaling and, in South Carolina and Mississippi, exceeding the white population. In the sixteen states and the District of Columbia which are included by the Government Census in the South Atlantic, East South Central and West South Central divisions, the total white population in 1860 was 7,033,973, and the total Negro population was 4,097,111. In 1920 the white population in the same states was 24,132,214 and the Negro population, 8,912,231. In other words, the white population multiplied three and one half times while the Negro population a little more than doubled. In the nation as a whole, the Negro element which was 16 per cent in 1860 sank to 11 per cent in 1920. In other words, one of the most conspicuous elements in the Negro problem fifty years ago has disappeared. Then it was predicted that the rate of Negro increase was so great that in a few years the South, certainly, and, in a little longer time, the nation would be engulfed in an overwhelming Negro numerical ascendancy. Out of this idea grew the fear which tainted the whole atmosphere in which the race question had to be dealt with. Already one can see the new aspect which the arithmetic of the Census has given to the entire discussion.

And the situation in the North has changed also. The decade from 1910 to 1920 has seen an acceleration of the movement of Negroes into almost all the northern

states. In Illinois the number advanced in this decade from 109,049 to 182,274; in Indiana from 60,320 to 80,810; in Ohio from 111,452 to 186,187; in Michigan from 17,115 to 60,082; in New York from 134,191 to 198,483; and in Pennsylvania from 193,919 to 284,568. There are now more Negroes in Pennsylvania than in Kentucky, Maryland, or Missouri. The growth of Negro population far exceeded the growth during the preceding decade and in some northern states surpassed in ratio the white growth. Great Negro communities grew up in cities like Detroit and Indianapolis which had never before had a Negro problem. The presence of Negro masses, which had constituted the gravamen of the problem in the South and which the North had never known, now brings the whole problem home to it.

Two questions arise from this movement. What is its cause? What will be the effect? The cause is twofold, social and economic:

Seeking freedom from restraints which were galling and which he hoped to find lessened in the North, the Negro was drawn by the demand for labor and by the higher wages. For some years this type of workman has moved North in small numbers, but now the farm-labor class also has begun to move. It is estimated that thirteen per cent of the farm labor of Georgia and three per cent from Alabama and South Carolina moved North in the twelve months ending in the spring of 1923.[1]

Even if this movement could be checked, and some

[1] The New York *Times*, April 23, 1923.

of the Southern States are attempting to check it by legislative measures which cannot be availing, its effects have already made themselves felt. The South, feeling the mass of unskilled labor on which it has rested slipping from under, has been led to deal further with the causes of racial discontent. The President of the Cotton Growers' Association said recently in Charleston:

> The Negro can be kept on the cotton plantation by kindness and personal attention. The landowner needs to get on the job. . . . There has been a lack of brotherly feeling between the landlord and tenant largely because they rarely saw each other. Leaving the management of plantations to overseers is seldom satisfactory. We may soon have to come to a profit-sharing basis of dealing with plantation labor.[1]

In other words, the old, old lesson—justice and brotherhood.

(6) We come now to the last and most difficult matter, social equality. What does this mean? Dr. DuBois answered:

> I mean no half-way measure; I mean full and fair equality. That is, the chance to obtain work regardless of color, to aspire to position and preferment on the basis of desert alone, to have the right to use public conveniences, to enter public places of amusement on the same terms as other people, and to be received socially by such persons as might wish to receive them. These are not extravagant demands, and yet their granting means the abolition of the color line. The question is: Can American Negroes hope to attain this result?

[1] Federal Council Commission on the Church and Social Service, Research Department *Bulletin*, May 5, 1923.

And to this Mr. Stone replied:

With equal clearness and precision, and with full comprehension of its larger meaning and significance and ultimate possibilities, the American white man answers the question in the language of another eminent American sociologist, Professor Edward A. Ross, in contrasting the attitudes of Anglo-Saxons and Latins toward other races on this continent: "The superiority of a race cannot be preserved without pride of blood and an uncompromising attitude toward the lower races. . . . Whatever may be thought of the latter policy, the net result is that North America from the Behring Sea to the Rio Grande is dedicated to the highest type of civilisation; while for centuries the rest of our hemisphere will drag the ball and chain of hybridism."

And thus the issue is joined. And thus also, perhaps, we find an answer to our own question, whether racial friction in this country is increasing and inevitable.[1]

Such an apparent deadlock would seem to promise nothing but war, a growing demand and a determined denial. But these words were written twenty years ago, and while the race problem is here now as really as then, and while the new conditions have aggravated the situation, we are nevertheless more hopeful of the solution of the problem than we have ever been. The matter of social equality does not so greatly trouble us. In the first place, social equality cannot be defined. It cannot be defined as between individuals, still less as between races. It is a phrase readily used because it looks clear and plain, but the moment it is examined it crumbles away. Men are not socially equal because they go to

[1] Stone, *Studies in the American Race Problem*, p. 240.

the same theater or eat in the same hotel. In the second place, what substance the phrase really signifies cannot be demanded. If it is felt and accorded, it is real. If it is not felt and accorded, the demand cannot secure it, and anyone demanding it would not be capable of receiving it. He might be given its form, but its reality can never be possessed by anyone who is capable of conceiving it as a demandable thing. All this is absolutely true of social equality without regard to race, and it is true of it with regard to race.

What we need to be rid of is all race servility and race arrogance, all discrimination for or against men on arbitrary and unreal grounds, all racial demand and racial assertion, all impatience and injustice. There are multitudes of men and women who are true friends across the lines of race. They understand and respect one another. They are working together with a unity of purpose and spirit in which there is no color line nor any wraith of a color line. They have transcended the old issues and know in their hearts that for them the new day has come. Our hope is in the increase of this company and their triumph over the agitators, the men of both races who use race to confirm or to refute race and who then use both the confirmation and the refutation as a means of intensifying race assertion or authority. Once again, the old and only solution is justice and brotherhood, justice to each race and to all the trusts and values of each race, and brotherhood within and across all the races; the maintenance by each race

of its self-respect and racial dignity, and the unity of all races in the fulfilment of their distinct and their common tasks.

2. *Immigration and the Race Problem*

The population of the forty-eight states and the District of Columbia in 1920 was 105,710,620. Of these, more than one half, 58,421,957, were native white of white parentage; more than one fifth, 22,686,204, were native white of foreign or mixed parentage; one eighth, 13,712,754, were foreign-born white; one tenth, 10,463,131, were Negroes. The problem of racial assimilation has diminished slightly. The foreign-born population in 1900 was 13.6 per cent of the whole and in 1910 it was 14.7 per cent and in 1920 it was 13.2 per cent.

On the other hand, the character of the races to be assimilated has changed from 1890 to 1910 and again from 1910 to 1920. The number of English, Scotch, Irish, and Welsh-born people in the United States has decreased in each period. The number of Greeks, Italians, and Mexicans has increased. The southeastern and eastern Europeans who leaped ahead from 1890 to 1910 have fallen off slightly. The effects of the war are evident especially on the Germans, Austrians, and the Hungarians. The figures show that the races from northern Europe, more easily assimilable and more available to aid in the process of assimilation, have

fallen off steadily, while the dissimilar and less assimilable races of southern and eastern Europe which sprang forward so rapidly between 1890 and 1910 have dropped between 1910 and 1920. What has been gained in the probability of successful assimilation in the latter case by the reduction of the problem seems to have been about offset in the percentages by the loss in the former case. It is interesting to note, however, the continued Italian gain and the steady Irish decline.

The problem has been modified also by the redistribution of immigration among the states. It is interesting to note the facts in a few races. The states which contain most English-born are, in order, as follows: New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, California, Illinois, and New Jersey. The states which contain most Irish-born are, in order, New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois, New Jersey, Connecticut. The states which contain most German-born are, in order, New York, Illinois, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey. The Poles are chiefly, in order, in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, and Ohio; the Russians in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Massachusetts; the Italians in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Illinois, and California.

Valuable studies have been made of various races in the New American Series published for the Home Missions Council and the Council of Women for Home Missions, covering thus far the Czecho-Slovaks in

America, the Poles, the Russians and Ruthenians, the Italians, the Magyars, and the Greeks.[1] No adequate study has yet been made of the intermixture of racial strains in the United States. The War and the new restrictions upon immigration checked the flow of immigrants from all lands, and in 1921 the total incoming stream of alien immigrants numbered 309,556 and of non-immigrants 150,487, as compared with 1,218,480 in 1914; 298,826 in 1916; 110,618 in 1918; 430,001 in 1920; and 1,285,349 in 1907. In the year 1922-1923 the alien immigrant newcomers numbered 522,919, while 81,450 left the country to return to Europe. The nation has evidently come to the purpose of trying at least so to control immigration and so to care for what is admitted that the process of assimilation can operate efficiently and all races be welded together harmoniously into one national life.

America has not solved the race problem yet in the case either of the Negro or of the immigrant, but real progress has been made toward its solution. The "melting pot" metaphor is at present a little discredited and it does not represent the mode of dealing with race relationships set forth in these studies. But the unity which it suggests, though still unattained, is nearer to us in the United States, in spite of the heterogeneity of our racial elements, than in any other country in the world.

[1] For detailed information regarding the books in this series, see the Reading List at the end of this book. See also Shriver, William P., *Immigrant Forces*, p. 43.

3. The Mexicans and the Japanese

There are two particular racial issues involved in our general immigration problem, the Mexican and the Japanese. Our Mexican population trebled between 1890 and 1910 and more than doubled between 1910 and 1920, due to the unsettlement of Mexico and to our security and industrial opportunity. Of the 478,382 Mexicans reported in 1920, 249,652 were in Texas, 86,610 in California, and 60,325 in Arizona. In Texas they constituted one tenth of the population and in Arizona not quite one fifth. The total foreign-born population in New York City is nearly two fifths of the whole and the children of foreign or mixed parentage are two fifths more. In proportion, the Mexican element in the southwest is a far simpler problem, with the same simple solution, justice and brotherhood, involving the adequate provision of the facilities for education and race advancement.

The Japanese problem has been the most perplexing of all, and the facts of the case and the right solution have been matters of dispute. The Chinese problem would be joined to the Japanese but for the acceptance, for the present at least, by China of the principle of race discrimination and the earnest rejection of that principle by Japan.

As to the number and increase of the Japanese in the United States, there can be no reasonable disagreement. The Census returns gave 63,070 Japanese males and

9,087 Japanese females in 1910 and 72,707 males and 38,303 females in 1920. Some alarmists have calculated that even under the Dillingham Immigration Law "the Japanese population of the United States in forty years would be two million, in eighty years ten million, and in one hundred and fifty years, one hundred million." [1] Opponents to the admission of the Japanese to the United States have argued that they were not assimilable, and that they were an economic and ethical and political menace. On the other hand, evidence has been offered that they will and do assimilate, and are ready for naturalization and Americanization. Attorney General Webb, arguing for the California Alien Land Laws which forbade aliens ineligible to citizenship to hold land in the state, was asked by Chief Justice Taft, "What we want to know is, what the Japanese are doing to which you take objection." Mr. Webb did not answer that the Japanese would not assimilate. He replied, "The white people refuse to assimilate with the Japanese, and as the Japanese line advances, we retreat and we do not like to retreat." [2] No doubt many of the Japanese in the United States propose to retain their Japanese nationality just as the Americans in Japan and China do, but many of the Japanese desire to be full Americans. Dr. Waterhouse recently conducted an investigation among 1,600 American-born Japanese young people with the following conclusion:

[1] McClatchey, *Our New Racial Problem*, p. 6.
[2] The New York *Times*, April 24, 1923.

Without hesitation we join the ranks of those who argue that the Japanese can be assimilated, and the more thoroughly we study the situation, the more powerful is the conviction that the debate about the Japanese would cease to be a debate at all if only all who argue against them could come into personal contact with the second generation of young men and women.[1]

The Japanese are not allowed to be Americanized, however. The Supreme Court has ruled that the privilege of naturalization is confined to white persons and those of African nationality and descent. Justice Sutherland in the Court's decision maintained that there was no intent to assert any offensive racial distinction and then disposed of the idea that color is a practicable criterion of race, but held that the term "white person" meant a member of the Caucasian race. He was not ready to say who were and who were not Caucasians, but clearly Japanese were not, and therefore they could not be naturalized.

Manifestly [said he] the test afforded by the mere color of skin of each individual is impracticable, as that differs greatly among persons of the same race, even among Anglo-Saxons, ranging by imperceptible gradations from the fair blonde to the swarthy brunette, the latter being darker than many of the lighter-hued persons of the brown or yellow races. Hence to adopt the color test alone would result in a confused overlapping of races and a gradual merging of one into the other without any practical line of separation. . . . The appellant, in the case now under consideration, however, is clearly of a race which is not Caucasian.[2]

[1] Waterhouse, Paul B., *Can the Japanese Be Assimilated?*
[2] The New York *Times*, Nov. 14, 1922.

This does not mean, however, that there are no Japanese-American citizens. The Constitution gives American citizenship to all American-born children of whatever race. Until 1906, alien Japanese could become American citizens. A few were naturalized. Then, without act of Congress, by a rule of the Bureau of Naturalization, clerks of court were forbidden to give application forms to any but "free white men" and "persons of African birth or descent." Since that date, no Japanese have been permitted to become naturalized citizens, except some four hundred who waived their right of exemption and joined our army. By that act they earned the right to become citizens, and did so in 1919.

The total increase of the Japanese population by immigration during the past twelve years is 12,174. This number consists chiefly of wives and children, who were lawfully admitted. Practically no new laborers were given passports by Japan or admitted to this country.

What is the rational and Christian racial policy for us to pursue toward the problem of the Japanese in America? The Japanese Exclusion League proposes:

1. To enact Japanese exclusion laws like those dealing with Chinese.
2. To prevent Japanese from owning or leasing any farm land whatever, and to reduce all Japanese agriculturists to the status of day laborers.
3. To forever prevent Japanese from becoming American citizens.

4. To deny American citizenship to all American-born Japanese children.

5. To have Congress pass the discriminatory drastic laws required to secure the above objects.

How much land do the Japanese own in California? The State Board of Control reports (1920) that the Japanese cultivate 458,056 acres, most of it under short term leases. Of this they own 74,769 acres. California has an area of about twenty-eight million acres of farm land. Of this, only one and six tenths per cent is cultivated by Japanese. They produce, however, thirteen per cent of California's total food output. Their produce is valued at $67,000,000, of which thirty-five per cent is paid to land owners as rentals and forty-five per cent to labor as wages. The balance of twenty per cent is the reward for Japanese tenants or contractors.

The National Committee for Constructive Immigration Legislation proposes a different course of action from the Exclusion League:

1. Congress should provide for the complete stoppage of Japanese immigration until it is clear that those in congested areas can and have become truly Americanized, establishing wholesome relations with the rest of the population.

2. The needed legislation should be free from features humiliating to Japanese, therefore free from offensive race discrimination. The new immigration law

should be general in scope and apply equally to all peoples.

3. The standards for naturalization should be raised, and the privileges of citizenship should be extended to all who qualify.

Which is the rational and humane course? Which course is in accord with the actual facts of race and race relationship which we have faced in these studies? [1]

4. The Indians and the Jews

Two other internal race problems enter into our American thinking, the Indian and the Jew.

It is very difficult to arrive at a just racial picture of the Indian. Was he a savage? Was he a noble savage? Was he no savage at all? John Heckewelder, one of the early Moravian missionaries to the Indians who came to America in 1754 and became Zeisberger's assistant, in his account of the Indians whom he had known intimately for fifty years, wrote in 1817 that nothing was so false as the savage picture of the Indian character.

> Every person [he says] who is well acquainted with the true character of the Indians will admit that they are peaceable, sociable, obliging, charitable, and hospitable among themselves, and that those virtues are, as it were, a part of their nature. In their ordinary intercourse, they are studious to oblige each other. They neither wrangle nor fight; they live, I believe, as peaceably together as any people on earth,

[1] Millis, H. A., *The Japanese Problem in the United States.*

and treat one another with the greatest respect. That they are not devoid of tender feelings has been sufficiently shown in the course of this work. I do not mean to speak of those whose manners have been corrupted by a long intercourse with the worst class of white men; they are a degenerate race, very different from the true genuine Indians whom I have attempted to describe.[1]

If we are in doubt as to whether to accept Heckewelder's estimate, which he supports with facts and testimonies as to the Indian races before contact with the whites, and are disposed to set against it the account which history gives of the Indians and of the wars waged against them, it is well to remember that the histories were written by the race which invaded the land and waged the wars, although we have also tried to do justice to the record and *A Century of Dishonor* will endure as an honest attempt to tell the truth and to right wrong. In reality the primitive Indian life was both evil and good, mixed as all life is, but certainly crude and harsh.

The story of race relationship between Indian and white is a long story of the wrong and deadly way to deal with such issues. It is clear that the Indians had no exclusive title to North America, that the white race was warranted in coming here and opening the continent to its intended uses. And no doubt, man being what he is, such a process will be filled with blunder and waste, as every advance of human life has been through history.

[1] Heckewelder, John, "Memoirs of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania," Vol. XII, *Indian Nations*, p. 330.

Our consolation is that we have come at last to a better mind regarding the Indian, and that reason and justice and Christian duty have at last been applied, in a measure at least, to this race problem. The evidence is found in the increase of the Indian population, its advancing prosperity and intelligence, its health and character. Any estimate of the number of Indians who were here on the discovery of America is mere guesswork. Dr. Eastman thinks the total number of natives of North America could not have been far from half a million.[1] "Since that period," he says, "they have fallen off in numbers though not to the extent popularly supposed, and are now slowly increasing." The census returns show that the Indians in the United States decreased from 256,127 in 1880 to 243,504 in 1890, and then increased to 270,544 in 1900 and to 340,838 in 1921.

The Hon. Cato Sells, when Commissioner of Indian Affairs, declared, "I repudiate the suggestion that the Indian is a 'vanishing race.' He should march side by side with white men during all the years to come. It is our chief duty to protect the Indian's health, and to save him from premature death. Before we educate him, before we conserve his property, we should save his life." [2]

The Indian's life seems to have been saved. At the same time, the line of demarcation between the two races becomes increasingly indistinct. The break-up of

[1] Eastman, Charles Alexander, "The North American Indian," *Universal Races Congress*, 1911, p. 367.

[2] Moore, John M., *The South Today*, p. 137.

the reservations, the allotment of land in severalty, the education of the Indians, the increase of wealth among them, the steady progress of Christianity, their economic community with the rest of the life of the land, the progress of intermarriage with other races, are all helping to heal their old sore and to merge the Indian both into the nation and into the race.[1]

To this great task the white race ought at last conscientiously to apply itself. It will have a great deal to contend against in its own base elements and in the effect of its past mistreatment of the Indian race, and the Indians still have many grievances, but we have made progress and we must go on until justice is done.[2]

A still more perplexing problem is that of Semitic race and anti-race feeling. These words raise at once the question about which both Jews and Gentiles are disagreed: Are the Jews a race and is the question of their relations to others a race question? Professor Boas answers no. There is no Italian or French or German race, he says. No more is there any Jewish race. While Professor Dixon includes the Jews among the racial groups, he seems to incline to the view of Dr. Boas.

This view that the Jews are not a race but an artificial nationality cemented by religion is set forth by Coudenhove, as quoted by a writer in *The Living Age.*

[1] Talbot, Mrs. Edith (Armstrong), *Samuel Chapman Armstrong,* Chap. X.

[2] The New York *Times,* May 12, 1923.

The so-called purity of the Jewish race is a fable. The word "Jew" has no ethnological significance. The whole controversy, so far as it rests upon race, is based on a groundless myth. It is essentially an empty and irrational dispute, because, from the physical standpoint, there are no such races as those alluded to. There is no such thing as a Semitic nation. A Semitic nation is solely a philological conception. The Semitic-speaking peoples differ radically from each other, and have no anatomical features in common with the Jews, or, in many cases, with each other. There is no pure Semitic type. The Jews are a mixed race. They have few traits in common with the Arabs, who come nearest to being pure Semites of any people. They resemble the Europeans among whom they live much more than they do the Bedouins.

But the honest reader will ask: "Do you mean to say there is no difference between a Jew and a Christian?" Certainly there is, but a difference due to historical rather than anatomical causes. The key to the puzzle is found in segregation which was partly voluntary and partly involuntary. At first the Jews lived apart from other peoples of their own volition; later they were forced to do this whether they so willed or not.

The saying is as old as it is true that the Jews are what the people among whom they live make them. What are the Jews really? The Jews are an artificial nation, sprung from an intermingling of countless nationalities, and forming a religious community. The existence of this religious community is maintained by voluntary accessions, the forced exclusion of its members from other social groups, and the prohibition of mixed marriages. This brings us to Count Coudenhove's definition: "The Jews are an artificial nationality created by a religious discipline out of innumerable racial elements." [1]

[1] Bertrand, Alexander, "Anti-Semitism," in *The Living Age*, June 23, 1923, pp. 699, 701.

There are Jews and Gentiles who dispute this view.[1] But whether or not the Jews are a race, they are a human group distinguished from other groups for all practical purposes as races are distinguished, and the question of the relations between them and other groups is identical with the general question of race relations, with three peculiar differentiations; namely, a special prejudice, just or unjust, against some of the characteristics of the Jews; an inheritance of evil incidents, of wrong done on both sides, perhaps predominantly on the side of the non-Jews; and an unequaled resistance to religious assimilation on the side of the Jews. To the extent that the view that Judaism is not a race but a religious culture is sound, the problem of relations will be dealt with efficiently only as a religious and cultural problem. And while there will be many who will reject the idea, nevertheless, the facts of American life will support it; namely, that the problem of Jewish race and anti-race feeling would be most quickly resolved if any considerable number of Jews were to become Christians. But if Judaism is not a race but a religious nationality, such a solution would mean the disappearance of the religion into Christianity and of the nationality into Americanism. On the other hand, it is clear that Judaism is not a homogeneous religion. There is a wider religious gulf between old and new Judaism than between either one and some non-Jewish religious groups. What, then, is it that holds all these Jewish groups together against

[1] See *The Nation*, May 16, 1923, p. 572.

all outside groups? Is there, after all, a racial bond, if not physiological, then social and moral, which is as real as any other racial bond?

It is no simple problem. And it is clear that there are faults of prejudice on both sides, Gentile and Jew.[1] How can we make some progress in America with its 3,900,000 Hebrews, with "the world's deepest and most influential Jewries"? By dealing, personally and socially, with the causes of ill-will and prejudice and seeking to remove them. What are they? A small conference between Jewish and Christian leaders recently named these:

1. Sheer misunderstandings.
2. Differences in habits and customs.
3. Economic competition.
4. Jealousy of success.
5. Fear of losing leadership.
6. Personal aggressiveness.
7. Bad manners.
8. Pride of intellect.
9. Gregariousness and its accompanying provincialism.
10. Dogmatic moods and utterances.
11. The air of superiority.
12. Selfishness.

And back of all there is the fundamental religious issue. Honest Jews and Christians alike should try in love to

[1] See *The American Hebrew*, July 28, 1922, Article by Dr. Joseph Jastrow, "What Is Prejudice? and Why?"; also Sept. 22, 1922, Article by Col. Harris Weinstock, "The Case Stated."

show each to the other the truth which he believes has been given to him to hold and to share.

5. *Our Relations to Latin America*

It is well for us in the United States and Canada to realize that Latin America does not love us and is not occupied in gazing with longing upon our prosperity and with admiration upon our blameless political righteousness. It distrusts and misbelieves our purposes. It derides our commercialism. It looks to France, not to us, for ideas and ideals.

> It is evident [says Manuel Ugarte] that nothing attracts us toward our neighbors of the North. By her origin, her education, and her spirit, South America is essentially European. We feel ourselves akin to Spain, to whom we owe our civilization, and whose fire we carry in our blood; to France, source and origin of the thought that animates us; to England, who sends us her gold freely; to Germany, who supplies us with her manufactures; and to Italy, who gives us the arms of her sons to wrest from the soil the wealth which is to distribute itself over the world. But to the United States we are united by no ties but those of distrust and fear.

Sr. Calderon calls us "the great plutocracy of the North," "the Yankee peril"; our policy toward Chile he calls "indecisive, turbid, Machiavelic." He monopolizes "America" as a term of speech applied to South America, as we have monopolized it for the United States. To be unified with the North American spirit

would be racial suicide, he thinks. He goes on to say:

"Where Yankees and Latin Americans intermingle, you may better observe the insoluble contradictions which divide them. The Anglo-Saxons are conquering America commercially and economically, but the traditions, the ideals, and the soul of these republics are hostile to them." He declares, "To save themselves from Yankee imperialism the American democracies would almost accept a German alliance, or the aid of Japanese arms. Everywhere the Americans of the North are feared." He sees no real unity in the United States. He does see "the triumph of vulgarity," the increase of divorce and criminality, "plebeian brutality, excessive optimism, violent individualism, confusion, uproar, instability." It is with Europe, and not with the United States and Canada, that Latin America would identify its commercial, political, and cultural interests.[1]

The people of the United States think of themselves as so animated with the spirit of justice and good-will that they cannot conceive how other people should mistrust them. But we need to see ourselves as others see us. "It will frae many a blunder free us, and foolish notion." We have a real piece of work ahead of us in working out right race relationships with our Latin American neighbors, but, once again, it can be done, and more easily than anywhere else in the world, by the old principle of justice and brotherhood.

There are many elements of union to bind us together

[1] Calderon, *Latin America, Its Rise and Progress.*

across the chasm of race, and they are far stronger than such writers as Calderon and Ugarte, representative though they be of the thought of Latin America, are ready to allow. And if we do our part, Latin America will meet us fully half-way and the Christian ideals and principles will determine our common movement. We have already seen how great is Latin America's own problem of race adjustments. It will help both her and us in our internal problems if we can make our inter-continental relationships right.

6. *Race Problems in All Lands*

The immigration problems are not ours alone. Canada and Australia share some of them with us and so far as these problems involve relations with the races of India, they come home to Canada as a member of the same Empire with India even more than to us. The population of Canada of British origin in 1921 constituted 54 per cent of the whole. Of the total population 28.96 per cent were of English origin, 27.91 per cent were French, 13.36 per cent Scotch, and 12.6 per cent Irish. Asiatics were less than one per cent of the whole. In the United States Asiatics were less than one sixth of one per cent. Canada has a far vaster undeveloped territory and a greater need of labor and a greater difficulty in assimilating the labor available, a less homogeneous population and a lighter Anglo-Saxon proportion, and a French-Catholic element almost equal

to its English stock and one half as strong as the whole British stock combined.

Australia's problem is greater still. Five million people have a continent of 2,946,691 square miles. The Northern Territory of Australia has an area of 523,620 square miles, or four times the size of France, with a population of 3,734 people. Would the argument that justified the white race in taking over America from the Indian because it could do so and needed it, justify the yellow race in taking over Australia if it needed it and could take it? If not, what but a right view of racial relationships will prevent? "Australians," says the Hon. Randolph Bedford, M.P., for Queensland, "have made racial purity their political religion." That is well. It will be well to add to this religion the elements of racial justice and racial brotherhood. Australia is justified in a policy of restricted immigration if that will secure best the interests of mankind. If not, she will be neither justified in forming the policy nor capable of enforcing it.

The Japanese have their race issues to deal with in Korea and China. When they took over Korea it was with the policy of political incorporation and racial amalgamation. They underestimated the spirit of the Korean people, their feeling of racial solidarity, and their will for freedom. There is an element in Japan which would crush all this with relentless military power. When the World War seemed to leave China at Japan's mercy, the Twenty-one Demands were pre-

sented which would have subjugated China to Japan almost as completely as Korea. And the same element in Japan which would crush Korea would deal as ruthlessly with the Chinese. But a better mind as to race rights and relationships has come to Japan, as it has come to us. It has found its way, in part, into power in new policies as to Korea and China, and it anticipates a fuller conquest.

No area of the world is free from these issues of race. They are the questions before men's minds day and night in South Africa.[1] Before the South African Union was formed the question of race relations was alive in the controversy over Chinese and Indian coolie labor and always in the problem of the native races. In Basutoland the population is almost wholly Bantu or native. In Natal it is nearly 80 per cent native, with 12 per cent more of Indians or half caste. In the Transvaal the native population is over 72 per cent; in the Union of South Africa it is 67 per cent; in Orange Free State it is 61 per cent; in the Cape it is 59 per cent. The white population is highest in Orange Free State, with 33 per cent, and lowest in Natal with 8 per cent. These were the census figures in 1911. In the whole of British South Africa in 1904 the white population was less than one fourth of the native or Bantu.

The native is limited in his right to buy and own

[1] Javabu, D. D. T., "Native Unrest in South Africa," in *International Review of Missions*, April, 1922, pp. 249, 259; "Colored Races in South Africa," in *The East and the West*, Oct., 1922, pp. 327-337.

land. Contact with white civilization has demoralized him. The reaction of such conditions on the white race is inevitable. Nature takes a sure revenge. The weaker group drags the stronger but smaller group down, "like a cancerous and suffocating burden at the heart." [1] The problem for South Africa, because of numbers, is far harder than for us in America, and also because, with all its disadvantages, slavery was a school for the American Negro for which the Bantu people have had no equivalent. But, ultimately, though it be far off, the solution of South Africa's race problem is not different from our own.

And India has its grave struggle over these same questions both at home and abroad. In the Kenya Colony in East Central Africa,[2] in Natal, in Guiana, the question of Indian race rights and relations is a living question. And race questions are the dominant questions in India itself. The three primary ethnographical divisions of mankind are all to be found within the area of the Indian Empire. Most of the Indian people are reckoned as belonging to the Caucasian type. The yellow race is found in the Lesser Himalayas and furnishes an important element in the ethnology of Bengal. The Negroid type is clear in the Andaman Islands and, some would hold, elsewhere in India. Four of the great families of the human speech

[1] Loram, *The Education of the South African Native*, pp. 9-11. See also Willoughby's admirable book, *Race Problems in the New Africa*.

[2] "The Problem of Kenya," *London Spectator*, May 5, 1923, p. 744 f.

are found in India, the Anstric, the Tibeto-Chinese, the Dravidian, and the Indo-European. The Moslem conquests also brought in the Semitic tongues, Persian and Arabic.[1] To reconcile all these racial and linguistic strains which have ramified in the centuries, to open the gates of organized society to the low castes, and to bind the Hindu and Mohammedan peoples, fictitiously united for a little while in the Nationalist Movement under Mr. Gandhi's leadership, but now wide apart and in some places more hostile than before,[2] to unite Brahman and non-Brahman, and also to hold together Indian and European in good-will and confidence—what other nation has more exacting racial problems than these?[3]

The race problem is offered to the Christian Church as a test and as an opportunity. On the foreign mission fields the missionaries of the Western Churches have it in their power to demonstrate in their relations with the people and in the relations of the missions with the Native Churches the right spirit and principle of race relationships. In the Eastern lands the new Christian Churches are called upon to illustrate the true attitude of race to race, eschewing alike all servility and all arrogance, asking nothing as a favor, and demanding nothing as a right, but doing right and deserving

[1] Griswold, *Peoples and Languages of the Indian Empire.*

[2] The Allahabad *Leader*, April 2, 1923, p. 3.

[3] The *Lahore Civil and Military Gazette*, March 23, 1923, paper by the Earl of Ronaldshay, ex-Governor of Bengal, on "The Clash of Ideals as a Source of Indian Unrest"; Alfred Nundy, *Indian Unrest 1919-20*, and *Political Problems*, Chaps. III, IX, XV.

right. In the West the Churches which have come down with rich, merged, racial inheritances should be the leaders in race service and sympathy. Least of all should any spirit of race antipathy or injustice appear in them. They are called to lead men to pay whatever price must be paid, in surrender of prejudice and of false and partial views and in the practice of brotherhood, in order that they may know the truth and its freedom.

The words of two Christian men, one of whom has lived through the race problem and the other of whom sought to think it through to its central truth, may well bring these studies to a close:

The first of these is one who came as an immigrant boy from Hungary, Dr. Steiner:

I should like to point out in which direction the most valuable lessons of my experience lie. I believe they are:

First, that racial characteristics are largely determined by environment.

Second, that race prejudice is an artificial product of the mind, induced by various influences.

Third, that in the highest and lowest spheres of thought and activity, all races are alike.

Fourth, that every human being, no matter what his color, race, faith, or class, has a right to earn the respect of his neighbor and his community, by virtue of *what he himself is.*

Fifth, that the brotherhood of man will become an established fact as soon as each man determines to live like a brother in his relation to his fellows.

Sixth, that Christianity has in its *spirit* the solution of class and race problems; but that in its *practice* it is lamentably far from solving them.

Seventh, that he who wishes to enter into fellowship with the nation or race with which he lives must free himself from all isolating practices and beliefs.

Eighth, that entrance into such a large human relationship has to be "bought with a price" and that it is a price worth paying; for there is no loftier human experience than that of becoming one with all mankind.[1]

The second of these two men is the late Viscount Bryce, who spent a long and honored life defending races against wrong and promoting understanding and good-will among men, and who wrote to America from the steamer on his return to England in October, 1921: "The most effective factor in getting rid of armaments would be to substitute for national hatred and rivalries a sense of the brotherhood of nations such as our Lord inculcated upon individual men. The idea that 'we are all members one of another' needs to be applied to *peoples.*"[2]

For this is the ultimate truth about the races. They are one body, of one blood.

[1] Steiner, Edward Alfred, *Against the Current*, p. 228 f.
[2] Bryce, James, *Goodwill*, April, 1922, p. 191.

READING LIST

READING LIST

The publications listed here are divided into two sections: I. Those referred to in the text of this volume; II. Other publications on race problems.

I. Publications Referred to in This Volume

ADAMS, HENRY. *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1919. $2.25.

AGASSIZ, ALEXANDER, *Letters and Reminiscences of,* with a sketch of his life and work. Edited by G. R. AGASSIZ. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. 1913. $3.50.

ANDREWS, C. F. *The Renaissance in India, Its Missionary Aspect.* United Council for Missionary Education, London. 1912.

ANESAKI, MASAHURU. *The Religious and Social Problems of the Orient.* Four lectures given at the University of California under the auspices of the Earl Foundation, Pacific School of Religion. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1923. $1.00.

ASLAN, KEVORK. *Armenia and the Armenians.* From the Earliest Times Until the Great War (1914). Translated from the French by PIERRE CRABITES. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1920. $1.40.

BAGEHOT, WALTER. *Physics and Politics,* or Thoughts on the Application of the Principles of "Natural Selection" and "Inheritance" to Political Society. D. Appleton and Co., New York. 1887. $2.00.

BEACH, HARLAN P. *India and Christian Opportunity.* The Student Volunteer Movement, New York. 1908. 50 cents.

BELLOC, HILAIRE. *The Jews.* Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. 1922. $3.00.

Boas, Franz. *The Mind of Primitive Man.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1913. $2.00.

Bryce, James. *The Treatment of the Armenians.* Blue Book, No. 31, 1916. Sir J. Canston and Sons, London. 1916.

Buckle, Henry Thomas. *History of Civilization in England.* 3 vols. Hearst's International Library Co., New York, 1913. $1.00.

Calderon, F. Garcia. *See* Garcia Calderon.

China's Intercourse with Europe. Translated by E. Harper Parker. Kelly and Walsh, Shanghai. 1890.

Commonwealth of Nations, The. Lionel Curtis, Editor. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1917. $2.50.

Conklin, Edwin Grant. *The Direction of Human Evolution.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1921. $2.50

DeGroot, J. J. M. *The Religion of the Chinese.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1910. $1.25.

Dennis, James Shepard. *Christian Missions and Social Progress.* Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 1897. $2.50.

Dickinson, G. Lowes. *Essay on the Civilizations of India, China, and Japan.* Doubleday, Page and Co., Garden City, N. Y. 1915. 60 cents.

Dixon, Roland B. *The Racial History of Man.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1923. $6.00.

Dowling, Theodore Edward. *The Armenian Church.* E. S. Gorham, New York. 1910. $1.00.

DuBois, W. E. Burghardt. *The Negro.* Henry Holt and Co., New York. 1915. 50 cents.

East, Edward M. *Mankind at the Crossroads.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1923. $3.50.

Farquhar, J. N. *The Crown of Hinduism.* Oxford University Press, New York. 1917. $1.40.

Finot, Jean. *Race Prejudice.* Translated by Florence Wade-Evans. E. P. Dutton and Co., New York. 1907. $3.00.

FORD, HENRY JONES. *The Scotch-Irish in America.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J. 1915. $2.00.

FOSTER, JOHN WATSON. *American Diplomacy in the Orient.* Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. 1903. $5.00.

GALTON, FRANCIS. *Inquiry into Human Faculty.* E. P. Dutton and Co., New York. 80 cents.

GARCIA CALDERON, FRANCISCO. *Latin America, Its Rise and Progress.* Translated by BERNARD NICOLL. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1913. $3.00.

GIBSON, J. CAMPBELL. *Mission Problems and Mission Meth ods in South China.* Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 1901. $1.50.

GOLDENWEISER, A. A. *Early Civilization.*

GOULD, C. W. *America: A Family Affair.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1922. $3.00.

GRANT, MADISON. *The Passing of the Great Race,* or The Racial Basis of European History. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1916. $2.00.

HAINES, CHARLES REGINALD. *Islam, as a Missionary Religion.* E. S. Gorham, New York. 70 cents.

HAMMOND, L. H. *In Black and White.* Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 1914. $1.50.

HAYNES, GEORGE EDMUND. *The Trend of the Races.* Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1922. 75 cents.

JACKSON, HELEN HUNT. *A Century of Dishonor.* A Sketch of the United States Government's Dealings with Some of the Indian Tribes. Little, Brown and Co., Boston. $1.50.

JONES, THOMAS JESSE. *Education in Africa.* A Study of West, South, and Equatorial Africa by The African Education Commission. Phelps-Stokes Fund, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York. 1922. $2.00.

JOSEY, CHARLES CONANT. *Race and National Solidarity.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1923. $2.50.

KIDD, BENJAMIN. *The Control of the Tropics.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1898.

LEROY, A. *The Religion of the Primitives.* Beauchesne, Paris. 1911.

LEROY-BEAULIEU. *The Awakening of the East.* Doubleday, Page and Co., Garden City, N. Y. 1900. $1.50.

LORAM, CHARLES TEMPLEMAN. *The Education of the South African Native.* Longmans, Green and Co., New York. 1917. $2.00.

LYALL, SIR ALFRED COMYN. *Asiatic Studies,* Religious and Social. 2 vols. Second Series. John Murray, London. 1889.

Mankind and the Church. An Attempt to Estimate the Contribution of Great Races to the Fulness of the Church of God. By seven bishops. Edited by RT. REV. H. H. MONTGOMERY, D.D. Longmans, Green and Co., New York. 1909. $2.75.

MELVILLE, HERMAN. *Typee,* or Four Months in the Marquesas. A peep at Polynesian life during a four months' residence in a valley of the Marquesans. New edition. Dodd, Mead and Co., New York. 1923. $3.50.

MILLIS, H. A. *The Japanese Problem in the United States.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1908. $2.25.

MOORE, JOHN M. *The South Today.* Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1916. 75 cents.

MÜLLER, FRIEDRICH MAX. *Lectures on the Science of Languages.* First Series. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1865.

MURPHY, EDGAR GARDNER. *Problems of the Present South.* A Discussion of Certain Educational, Industrial, and Political Issues in the Southern States. Longmans, Green and Co., New York. 1909. $1.75.

NASSAU, ROBERT HAMILL. *Fetichism in West Africa.* Forty Years' Observation of Native Customs and Superstitions. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1904. $2.50.

NUNDY, ALFRED. *Indian Unrest.* The Garhwali Press, Dehra Dun, India. 1921.

PAGE, JESSE. *The Black Bishop.* Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 1909. $2.00.

Papers on Interracial Problems. Presented to the First Universal Races Congress, held at the University of London, July 26-29, 1911. Edited by G. SPILLER. Published by the Universal Races Congress. King and Son, London. 1911. 7s. 6d.

PARK, ROBERT EZRA and BURGESS, ERNEST W. *Introduction to the Study of Sociology.* University of Chicago, Chicago. 1911. $4.50.

PEARSON, C. H. *National Life and Character.* The Macmillan Co., New York. $2.00.

Races Congress, Papers Presented to. See *Papers on Interracial Problems.*

RATZEL, FRIEDRICH. *The History of Mankind.* 3 vols. Translated from the German by A. J. BUTLER. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1896. $3.00 a volume.

Reconstruction in Turkey. A Series of Reports Compiled for the American Committee of Armenian and Syrian Relief. WILLIAM H. HALL, Editor. 1 Madison Avenue, New York. For private distribution only. 1918.

REINSCH, PAUL S. *World Politics at the End of the Nineteenth Century as Influenced by the Oriental Situation.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1913. $2.25.

RICE, ALLEN THORNDIKE. *Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln.* North American Publishing Co., New York. 1886.

RODÓ, JOSÉ ENRIQUE. *Ariel.* Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston. 1922. $1.25.

ROEMER, JEAN. *Origin of the English People and the English Language.* D. Appleton and Co., New York. 1888.

ROSS, EDWARD ALSWORTH. *Social Psychology,* an Outline and Source Book. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1913. $2.10.

South of Panama. Century Co., New York. 1915. $3.00.

Russell, Bertrand Arthur William. *The Problem of China.* Century Co., New York. 1922. $2.00.

Shriver, William P. *Immigrant Forces.* Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1913. 75 cents.

Slater, Thomas Ebenezer. *The Higher Hinduism.* E. Stock, London. 1902.

Sloane, William Milligan. *The Balkans, a Laboratory of History.* Abingdon Press, New York. 1914. $1.50.

Smith, W. Robertson. *The Religion of the Semites.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1907. $2.50.

South African Natives, The. Their Progress and Present Condition. Edited by South African Races Committee. E. P. Dutton and Co., New York. 1908. $2.00.

South Mobilizing for Social Service, The. Addresses delivered at the Southern Sociological Congress. James E. McCulloch, Editor. The Southern Sociological Congress, Nashville. 1913. $2.00.

Speer, Robert E. *Missions and Modern History.* A Study of the Missionary Aspects of Some Great Movements of the Nineteenth Century. 2 vols. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 1904. Out of print. May be found in missionary libraries.

Stewart, James. *Dawn in the Dark Continent,* or, Africa and its Missions. The Duff Missionary Lectures for 1902. Oliphant, Edinburgh. 1903. Out of print. May be found in missionary libraries.

Stoddard, Lothrop. *The New World of Islam.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1921. $3.00.

The Revolt Against Civilization. The Menace of the Underman. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1922. $2.50.

The Rising Tide of Color against White World Su-

premacy. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1920. $3.00.

Stone, Alfred Holt. *Studies in the American Race Problem.* Doubleday, Page and Co., Garden City, N. Y. 1908. $2.00.

Storrs, Richard S. *The Divine Origin of Christianity.* Pilgrim Press, Boston. 1884.

Temple, Charles Lindsay. *Native Races and Their Rulers.* Argus Publishing and Printing Co., Cape Town, South Africa. 1918.

Thomas, William Hannibal. *The American Negro.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1901. $2.00.

Thorndike, Edward Lee. *Educational Psychology.* Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 1913-14. $2.00.

Townsend, Meredith White. *Asia and Europe.* G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1911.

Toynbee, Arnold Joseph. *The Western Question in Greece and Turkey.* Archibald Constable and Co., London. 1922.

Uhlhorn, Gerhard. *The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1891.

Universal Races Congress, Papers Presented to. See *Papers on Interracial Problems.*

Vambery, Arminius. *Western Culture in Eastern Lands.* A Comparison of the Methods Adopted by England and Russia in the Middle East. John Murray, London. 1906.

Warneck, John. *The Living Christ and Dying Heathenism.* Fleming H. Revell Co., New York.

Washington, Booker T. *Up From Slavery.* Doubleday, Page and Co., Garden City, N. Y. 1907. $1.90.

Weale, B. L. Putnam. *The Conflict of Colour,* or The Threatened Upheaval Throughout the World. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1910. $2.00.

Western Races and the World. F. S. Marvin, Editor. Oxford University Press, New York. 1922. $4.20.

Whipple, Henry Benjamin. *Lights and Shadows of a Long Episcopate.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1902. $2.50.

Willoughby, W. C. *Race Problems in the New Africa.* Clarendon Press, Oxford. 1923. 15s.

II. Other Publications on Race Problems

General

Abbott, Grace. *The Immigrant and the Community.* Century Co., New York. 1917. $1.50.

Americanization studies carried on by the Carnegie Corporation.[1] Harper and Brothers, New York. $2.50 per volume.

Daniels, John. *America via the Neighborhood.* A discussion of community forces, American and foreign, making for assimilation of the alien. 1920.

Thompson, F. V. *Schooling of the Immigrant.* 1920.

Park, R. E. and Miller, H. A. *Old World Traits Transplanted.* 1921.

Speek, P. A. *A Stake in the Land.* 1921.

Davis, M. M., Jr., *Immigrant Health and the Community.* 1921.

Breckinridge, S. P. *New Homes for Old.* 1921.

Park, R. E. *Immigrant Press and Its Control.* 1922.

Gavit, J. P. *Americans by Choice.* 1922.

Claghorn, K. H. *Immigrants' Day in Court.* 1923.

Brooks, Charles A. *Christian Americanization.* Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1919. 75 cents.

[1] *America via the Neighborhood* and *Old World Traits Transplanted* are of especial value to readers of this book.

COMMONS, J. R. *Races and Immigrants in America.* New edition. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1920. $2.50.

JOHNSTON, SIR HARRY. *The Backward Peoples and Our Relations with Them.* Oxford University Press. 1920.

MATHEWS, BASIL. *The Clash of Colour.* A Study in the Problem of Race. Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1924. Price to be announced.

OLDHAM, J. H. *Christianity and the Race Problem.* George H. Doran Co., New York. 1924. Price to be announced.

Racial Relations and the Christian Ideal. A Discussion Course for College Students. Committee on Christian World Education, 25 Madison Avenue, New York. 1923. 25 cents.

Selected Articles on Immigration. EDITH M. PHELPS, Compiler. H. W. Wilson Co., New York. 1920.

Bibliographies

A Bibliography for Social Workers Among the Foreign Born. Divisions of work for Foreign-born Women, National Board, Y.W.C.A., 600 Lexington Avenue, New York.

Bibliography and list of foreign-born from "Who's Who in America" in *Foreign-born Americans, Their Contribution.* Carnegie Public Library, Pittsburgh. 1920. Free on request.

Handbook-Bibliography on Foreign Language Groups, A. Prepared by the Joint Committee on Foreign Language Publications. AMY BLANCHE GREENE, Compiler. Data on numbers, distribution, and religious life of the foreign-language groups in America and summaries of Protestant work among them. A bibliography for each group containing books about the group and also the principal works by its representatives. Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1924. Cloth $1.50; paper $1.25.

Handbook on Racial and Nationality Backgrounds. Minnie M. Newman. Published in six sections, each containing a bibliography on its respective group. The Womans Press, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York. Each section, 50 cents.

I Peoples of the Near East.
II Southern and Central Europeans.
III Slavic Peoples.
IV Peoples of the Far East.
V Spanish-speaking Peoples, French Canadians.
VI Peoples of Scandinavia and the Baltic States.

Immigrant Backgrounds. Bulletin of the Russell Sage Foundation Library. Number 41. The Russell Sage Foundation Library, 130 East Twenty-second Street, New York. June, 1920. 10 cents.

"Selected Readings" (a bibliographical list) in *Essentials of Americanization.* Emory S. Bogardus. University of Southern California Press, Los Angeles. 1919.

Information Service of the Federal Council issued weekly, $2.50 per year. Race Relations numbers of this Service issued every six weeks.

European Peoples in America

Berkson, Isaac Baer. *Theories of Americanization.* A Critical Study with Special Reference to the Jewish Group. Teachers College. 1920. $3.00.

Burgess, Thomas. *Greeks in America.* Sherman French. 1913. $2.50.

Davis, Jerome. *The Russian Immigrant.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1922. $1.50.

Malcolm, M. V. *Armenians in America.* Pilgrim Press, Boston. 1919. $1.50.

Mangano, Antonio. *Sons of Italy.* Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1917. 75 cents.

Racial Studies. New American Series. George H. Doran Co., New York. Published for the Home Missions Council and the Council of Women for Home Missions. 1922. $1.00 a volume.

Davis, Jerome. *The Russians and Ruthenians in America.*

Fox, Paul. *The Poles in America.*

Miller, Kenneth D. *The Czecho-Slovaks in America.*

Rose, Philip M. *The Italians in America.*

Souders, D. A. *The Magyars in America.*

Xenides, J. P. *The Greeks in America.*

Ross, Edward A. *The Old World in the New.* The Significance of Past and Present Immigration to the American People. Century Co., New York. $3.00.

Thomas, W. I. and Znaniecki, Floria. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America.* 5 vols. Vols. I and V most important. Badger, Boston. 1918-20. $5.00 per volume.

Indians and Spanish Americans

Lindquist, G. E. E. *The Red Man in the United States.* An Intimate Study of the Social, Economic and Religious Life of the American Indian. With a Foreword by the Honorable Charles H. Burke, Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Contains a valuable bibliography. George H. Doran Co., New York. 1923. $3.50.

Moffett, Thomas C. *The American Indian on the New Trail.* The Red Man of the United States and the Christian Gospel. Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1914. 75 cents.

Stowell, Jay S. *The Near Side of the Mexican Situation.* George H. Doran Co., New York. 1921. $1.50.

Study of Mexican and Spanish Americans in the United States, A Survey of Interchurch World Movement. Home Missions Council, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York. 1920. 20 cents.

THOMPSON, WALLACE. *The Mexican Mind.* A Study of National Psychology. Little, Brown and Co., Boston. 1922. $2.50.

A catalogue of books on Indians, for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., may be obtained from Government Printing Office. They are largely reports of Smithsonian Institute, and deal with all phases of Indian Life.

The Negro in America

BRAWLEY, BENJAMIN G. *A Social History of the American Negro.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1921. $4.00.

EVANS, MAURICE S. *Black and White in the Southern States.* A study of the race problem in the United States from a South African point of view. Longmans, Green and Co. 1915.

HAMMOND, L. H. *In the Vanguard of a Race.* Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1922. 75 cents.

REUTER, EDWARD B. *The Mulatto in the United States.* Including a Study of Mixed-Blood Races Throughout the World. Badger, Boston. 1918.

Selected Articles on the Negro Race Problem. JULIA E. JOHNSEN, Compiler. H. W. Wilson and Co., New York. 1921. $1.25.

Select Discussions of Race Problems. BRIGHAM, JOHN A., Editor. Atlanta University Press, Atlanta, Ga. 1916.

SELIGMAN, H. J. *The Negro Faces America.* Harper and Brothers, New York. 1920. $1.75.

WEATHERFORD, W. D. *The Negro, From Africa to America.* George H. Doran Co., New York. 1924. $5.00.

WOODSON, CARTER G. *A Century of Negro Migration.* Association for Study of Negro Life and History, 1216 U Street, Washington, D. C. 1918. $1.00.

WORK, MONROE N. *The Negro Year Book for 1921-22.* Negro Year Book Co., Tuskegee Institute, Alabama. Cloth, $1.25; paper, 75 cents.

Bibliography

A list of books on Negro life and race relations may be obtained from the Commission on the Church and Race Relations, Federal Council of Churches, 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York. The Commission can also supply free of charge pamphlets on interracial co-operation, race relations, Sunday observance, the lynching evil, statements on Negro migration, etc. Six cents postage should accompany request.

Oriental Peoples in America

COOLIDGE, MARY ROBERTS. *Chinese Immigration.* Henry Holt and Co., New York. 1909.

GULICK, SIDNEY L. *American Democracy and Asiatic Citizenship.* Charles Scribner's Sons. 1918. $2.25.

The American-Japanese Problem. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1914. $2.50.

Japanese Immigration and Colonization Japanese Committee of Justice. Government Printing. 1922.

Japan to America. A Symposium of Papers by Political Leaders and Representative Citizens of Japan on Conditions in Japan and on the Relations Between Japan and the United States. Edition issued under the Auspices of The Japan Society. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. $1.25.

KAWAKAMI, K. K. *The Real Japanese Problem.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1923. $1.00.

PITKIN, WALTER B. *Must We Fight Japan?* Century Co. 1921. $2.50.

TOW, J. S. *The Real Chinese in America.* The Academy Press, 112 Fourth Avenue, New York. 1923.

The following pamphlets and folders may be secured from the Commission on International Justice and Good-will of the Federal Council for Churches in America, 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York:

American-Japanese Relations 1916-1920. A Retrospect. Sidney L. Gulick.

Japanese in Hawaii. Romanzo Adams. 1924. 25 cents.

New Factors in American Japanese Relations. 1924. 25 cents.

Recent Developments in our Relations with the Orient. 5 cents.

Shall Congress Enact Special Legislation Affecting Japanese? 50 cents.

III. Books for a Small Reference Library

The following titles from the above lists are suggested for a working reference library on race problems for groups wishing to purchase a limited number of standard but comparatively inexpensive books.

BOAS, FRANZ. *The Mind of Primitive Man.* The Macmillan Co., New York. 1913. $2.00.

A clear and just-minded presentation of some of the problems of race capacity and development.

BRYCE, JAMES. *The Relations of the Advanced and Backward Races of Mankind.* Oxford University Press, New York. 70 cents.

A noble-minded man's recognition of the principle of trusteeship and justice and brotherly good-will in race relationships.

Conklin, Edwin Grant. *The Direction of Human Evolution.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1921. $2.50.

This is one of the most reasonable and best balanced books on race development, conceiving race in biological rather than cultural terms, and with strong leaning to the predominance of heredity over education.

Finot, Jean. *Race Prejudice.* Translated by Florence Wade-Evans. E. P. Dutton and Co., New York. 1907. $3.00.

Probably the keenest and most thoroughgoing of all the books written in criticism of the ultra-biological theory of race and race-determinism. Almost as extreme in depreciating race as Stoddard is in exalting it.

Haynes, George Edmund. *The Trend of the Races.* Council of Women for Home Missions and Missionary Education Movement, New York. 1922. 75 cents.

A fresh, authoritative, fair-spirited account of the progress of the Negro race in America and its present problems of character, education, and relationship.

Josey, Charles Conant. *Race and National Solidarity.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1923. $2.50.

A frank and explicit repudiation of the ideals of universalism and brotherhood and an assertion of the right of the white race to subjugate and exploit the other races.

Oldham, J. H. *Christianity and the Race Problem.* George H. Doran Co., New York. 1924.

A careful, thoughtful statement of the Christian principles of race relationship and their application to the race problems created by the new conditions of the modern world.

Racial Relations and the Christian Ideal. A Discussion Course for College Students. Committee on Christian World Education, 25 Madison Avenue, New York. 1923. 25 cents.

A brief suggestive statement of questions and sources of material, both facts and opinions, useful for classes or groups which are working on the race problem.

Selected Articles on the Negro Problem. Julia E. Johnsen, Compiler. The Handbook Series. H. W. Wilson and Co., New York. 1921. $2.25.

This is the best body of material on all aspects of the Negro problem in America which can be found in a small space. It is fair, just and kind.

Speer, Robert E. *Race and Race Relations.* Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. Ready October 1, 1924. $3.00.

An unabridged discussion and source book on the race question of which this study book, *Of One Blood,* is an abbreviation. It contains also a chapter by the late Sir Narayan Chandavarkar of Bombay written expressly for this discussion.

Stoddard, Lothrop. *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy.* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1920. $3.00.

A popular argument for the superiority of the white race and for the assertion of its superiority over the awakened spirit of the other races, no longer willing to accept a status of subserviency to the white race.

INDEX

Adams, Henry, cited, 96.
Africa, liquor trade in, 110; race problems in, 232; slave trade in, 110; struggle of races in, 119; white man in, 106-110.
Africa, South, education in, 160.
Agassiz, Alexander, cited, 159.
Allegret, Elie, quoted, 49.
Andrews, C. F., quoted, 184.
Animism, 150.
Armenians, abuses of, 120.
Australia, race problems of, 230.
Awdry, Bishop, quoted, 85.

Bagehot, Walter, quoted, 136, 177.
Beach, Harlan P., quoted, 91.
Beaulieu, Leroy, quoted, 54.
Bedford, Randolph, quoted, 231.
Belloc, Hilaire, quoted, 47, 185.
Bertrand, Alexander, quoted, 224.
Bible, cited on Christian universality, 155-159; on John's vision, 82; on race as "mother," 66; on race feelings, 26-28; on race relations, 2; on solution of race problems, 198.
Boas, Franz, quoted, 19, 38, 45, 60, 224.
Bryce, James, quoted, 39, 121, 186, 205, 236.
Buckle, Henry T., quoted, 54, 135, 147.
Buddhism, universal principle of, 151.

Cæsar, Julius, cited, 24.
Calderon, F. G., quoted, 40, 185, 229.
California, Japanese in, 216-220.
Canada, race problems of, 230.
Carlyle, A. J., cited, 25.
Caucasian race, characteristics of, 11, 13, 17.
China, opium trade in, 111.
Chinese, 11; Christianity and, 92; civilization of, 34; contributions of, 87; in U. S., 216; treatment of, 116; troubles with Japan, 231.
Christian churches, race problems test of, 234.
Christianity, in mission lands, 92; Indians and, 223; race problems and, 153, 200, 234; solving race problems, 189.
Cochran, J. B., quoted, 134.
Conklin, Edwin G., quoted, 6, 8, 11, 20, 22, 29, 62, 162, 171, 175, 178, 180, 195.
Curry, J. L. M., cited, 191.
Curtis, Lionel, quoted, 150.

Davids, Rhys, quoted, 149, 152.
DeGroot, J. M., quoted, 150.
Democracy, ideal of, 194.
Dewey, John, quoted, 60.
Dickinson, G. Lowes, quoted, 90.
Dillingham Immigration Law, 217.
Dixon, Roland B., quoted, 10, 12, 21, 130, 175, 224.
Douglass, Frederick, quoted, 126.
DuBois, W. E. B., quoted, 21, 38, 50, 106, 113, 115, 182, 210.

Eastman, Charles A., quoted, 223.
Education, effect of, on race, 5.
Eugenics, as solution of race problem, 171.
Encyclopædia Britannica, quoted, 29, 140.
English, the, 17.
Environment, effect of, 5.
Eurasians, race amalgamation of, 184.
Europeans in the United States, 213.

Family life, Semitic view of, 2.
Field, G. C., 6, 8.
Finch, Earl, quoted, 177.
Finot, Jean, quoted, 9, 11, 14, 45, 51, 130, 137, 139.
Fleming, D. J., quoted, 61.
Ford, H. J., cited, 18.
Foreign population of U. S., 213.
Foster, John W., quoted, 41, 107, 110, 111, 159.
Fouillée, Alfred, quoted, 147, 148.
Frank, Tenney, quoted, 173.

Galtier, Jos., quoted, 18.
Galton, Francis, quoted, 20, 171, 173.
Gandhi, cited, 38, 234.
Gerard, Réné, quoted, 154.
Gibson, J. Campbell, quoted, 96.
Goldenweiser, A. A., quoted, 144.
Grant, Madison, quoted, 22, 43, 166.
Griswold, quoted, 234.
Guggisberg, Sir F. G., quoted, 48.

Hammond, L. H., quoted, 63, 68, 204.
Hawaiian Islands, struggle against liquor in, 107.
Haynes, George E., cited, 152, 202.
Hebrews, race-consciousness of, 26.
Heckewelder, John, quoted, 221.
Heredity, effect of, on race, 5.
Hinduism, principles of, 151.
Hoare, Bishop, quoted, 87.
Hobson, J. A., quoted, 107.
Holtom, quoted, 36.
"Hymn of Hate," Anti-Japanese, 100.

Ideals of races, 144.
Immigration, problems of, 213, 216.
India, 104; Christianity and, 162; civilization of, 36; contributions of races of, 90; low castes of, 159; race problems in, 233; soul of, 72.
Indians, American, 116, 221.
Intolerance in the United States, 123.
Italians, treatment of, 116.

Jackson, Helen Hunt, cited, 116.
Japan, opium trade in, 111.
Japanese, civilization of, 35; contributions of, 85, 88; exclusion of, 219; "hymn of hate" against, 100; in U. S., 216-220; naturalization of, 218; race problems in Asia, 231; trouble with China, 216.
Jews, classification of, 17; differences with Christians, 227; problem of, 221, 224; superiority of, 47; treatment of, 118.
Jones, H. Stuart, quoted, 24-26.
Jones, Thomas Jesse, quoted, 108.
Josey, Professor, quoted, 41.
Javabu, D. D. T., cited, 232.

Kakehi, Dr., quoted, 36.
Keith, Sir Arthur, quoted, 11.
Kidd, Benjamin, quoted, 30, 45, 52, 77, 161, 191.
Kinross, Albert, cited, 194.
Kipling, Rudyard, cited, 100.
Korea, Japanese problem in, 231.
Ku Klux Klan, intolerance of, 123.
Kulamer, John, cited, 140.

Lamarck, cited, 15.
Language, aspect of race relations, 104, 129, 137.
Lasker, Bruno, quoted, 3, 59.
Latin-American peoples, complexity of, 39; relations of, to U. S., 228.
League of Nations indicates racial trusteeship, 193.
Lefroy, Bishop, quoted, 89, 152.
LeRoy, A., quoted, 2, 150.
Licentiousness, weaker races exposed to, 106.
Lincoln, Abraham, cited, 126.
Loram, Charles T., quoted, 170, 223.
Louisiana, riots in, 117.
Lyall, A. C., quoted, 177.
Lyde, Lionel W., cited, 130.
Lynching in U. S., 124.

MacDougall, Professor, quoted, 6, 8.
MacNicol, H., cited, 93.
Mangin, General, quoted, 49.
Maran, Réné, quoted, 38.
Marvin, F. S., quoted, 23, 64, 166.
McClatchey, quoted, 217.
Melville, Herman, quoted, 106.
Meston, Lord, quoted, 162, 192.
Mexicans in U. S., 216.
Mexico, U. S. expeditions into, 193.
Millis, H. A., quoted, 221.
Mills, J. S., quoted, 7.
Mohammedans, extension of belief of, 152; in India, 234; religious contribution of, 89.
Mongol race, characteristics of, 11, 12, 13, 16; superiority of, 34.
Moore, John M., quoted, 113, 223.
Morse, Jedediah, quoted, 33.
Morse, Josiah, quoted, 56.
Moyser, William, quoted, 104.
Müller, Max, quoted, 105.
Murphy, E. G., cited, 188, 194.
Myers, Dr., quoted, 4.

Napoleon, cited, 192.
Nationality, differs from race, 137.
Naturalization of Japanese, 218.
Negro, 11-15, 19, 32, 56, 106; amalgamation with whites, 187; Civil War and, 122; color of, 130; educational opportunity of, 206; franchise of, 126; in contact with whites, 106-110; lynching of, 124; moving North, 208; political equality of, 205; prejudice against color of, 132; progress of, 204; redistribution of in U. S., 207; relation with whites, 200; slaves, 112; status of in U. S., 203; superiority of, 38, 48-50; when civilized, 84.

New Guinea, Bishop of, quoted, 84.
Nuttall, Archbishop, quoted, 84.

Opium trade, 111.
Origin of races, 1, 2, 13.
Ortolan, quoted, 2.

Page, Walter, quoted, 133.
Papuan race, 83.
Park, Robert E., quoted, 60, 98, 131.
Parker, E. H., quoted, 35.
Pearson, C. H., quoted, 165, 189.
Pepper, Nathaniel, cited, 192.
Petrie, W. M. Flinders, quoted, 88.
Pituitary body, 11, 12.

Race Consciousness, in the Bible, 26; origin of, 23; Roman idea of, 24.
Race problems, 29, 97, 147; Christianity and, 153, 189, 200, 234; immigration affecting, 213; in Africa, 232; in Australia, 230; in Canada, 230; in India, 233; in Japan, 231; solution of, 163, 189, 235; solved by amalgamation, 173.
Race relations, 1, 14, 129, 200, 216, 221.
Races, abuse of weaker, 109; accepted groupings of, 15; amalgamation of, 173; antipathy and fear of, 97; arrogance of, 125; as "mothers," 66; benefited by contact with whites, 108; biological view of, 10, 13; capacities of, 7; color of, 129; common interests of, 190; consciousness of, 23-28; contribution of the, 82-91; definition of, 10, 14; economic interdependence of, 77; effect of climate on, 134; effect of education on, 5; effect of environment on, 5; effect of inheritance on, 4; effect of isolation on, 140; equality of, 195; error in alleged superiority of, 51-58; evils and abuses of, 97; friction of, in U. S., 46, 123; gain from distinction of, 66; humanity enriched by, 67; idea of inequality of, 42; idea of superiority of, 33, 51; interrelation of, 14; mental differences of, 4; mixture of, 173, 215; modern problem of, 29, 97, 147, 163; mutability of, 20; nature of, 1; non-unity of, within, 17; not pure, 20; origin of, 1, 2, 13; physical characteristics of, 12; prejudice against, 104; relationships of, 1, 129, 200, 216, 221; religion and problems of, 147; self-determination and pride of, 70; slavery of, 112; social ideals of, 144; solution of segregation of, 166; solution of subjection of, 169; struggle of, in Africa, 119; in Armenia, 120; in Asia, 119; in Europe, 119; in Near East, 122; unity of, 22, 63, 64.
Ratzel, Friedrich, cited, 144.
Red race, 33.
Reinsch, Paul S., quoted, 138, 142, 197.
Religion in race problem, 147.
Robertson, John M., quoted, 70.
Rodó, José E., quoted, 40.
Romans, race consciousness of, 24.
Ross, E. A., quoted, 9, 14, 147, 198, 211.
Russell, Bertrand, quoted, 35, 92.

Savages, animism of, 150; capacities of, 60; superiority of, 41; weaknesses of, 83.
Scotch-Irish, clashes with English, 17, 118.
Sells, Cato, quoted, 223.
Sex and race antipathies, 144.
Slater, Thomas E., quoted, 93.
Slavery, 110, 112.
Smith, Bosworth, cited, 90.
Smith, J. A., quoted, 63.
Smith, W. Robertson, quoted, 2, 149.
Solid South, 207.
South America, race amalgamation in, 185.
Southern Sociological Congress, 201, 207.
Spiller, G., quoted, 171.
Steiner, Edward, A., quoted, 235.
Stewart, James, quoted, 108, 119, 161.
Stoddard, Lothrop, quoted, 6-8, 10, 43, 80, 137, 163, 166.
Stone, A. H. quoted, 32, 46, 58, 72, 97, 99, 114, 211.
Storrs, R. S., quoted, 112.
Sutherland, Justice, quoted, 218.

Taft, William H., quoted, 217.
Tagore, Rabindranath, quoted, 36.
Taine, H. A., cited, 5.
Talbot, Edith A., cited, 224.
Temple, Charles L., quoted, 170, 187.
Temple, Sir Richard, quoted, 91.

Thomas, William H., quoted, 114, 132.
Thomson, J. Arthur, quoted, 11, 15.
Thorndike, Edward L., quoted, 196.
Trusteeship of knowledge, 192.
Twenty-One Demands on China, 231.

Uhlhorn, Gerhard, quoted, 112, 155.

Vambery, Arminius, quoted, 120.
Von Luschan, Felix, quoted, 22, 39, 51, 130, 164.

Warneck, John, cited, 96.
Washington, Booker, quoted, 55, 73, 133.
Waterhouse, Paul B., quoted, 218.
Weale, B. L. Putman, quoted, 75, 101, 131, 135, 153.
Weatherford, Dr., quoted, 207.
Webb, Attorney General, quoted, 217.
Wells, H. G., quoted, 97.
Whipple, Henry B., quoted, 116.
White race. *See:* Caucasian; amalgamation with Negro, 187; relation with Negro, 200.
Williams, Mornay, quoted, 198.
Willoughby, W. C., quoted, 109.
Woods, quoted, 7.

Young, Arthur, cited, 133.

DATE DUE

FEB 22 19[illegible]

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

301.451
S742

Speer, Robert Elliott
AUTHOR

Of one blood.
TITLE

301.451
S742 Speer, Robert Elliott
Of one blood.

N12810